



The Yukon Legislative Assembly

Number 6

4th Session

24th Legislature

HANSARD

Wednesday, April 1, 1981 — 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: The Honourable Donald Taylor

Yukon Legislative Assembly

SPEAKER — Honourable Donald Taylor, MLA, Watson Lake
DEPUTY SPEAKER — Grafton Njootli, MLA, Old Crow

CABINET MINISTERS

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PORTFOLIO
Hon. Chris Pearson	Whitehorse Riverdale North	Government Leader — responsible for Executive Council Office, Finance, Public Service Commission, Pipeline, Land Claims, Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice.
Hon. Dan Lang	Whitehorse Porter Creek East	Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, Tourism and Economic Development, Government Services, Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Workers' Compensation Board.
Hon. Geoffrey Lattin	Whitehorse North Centre	Minister responsible for Highways and Public Works, Municipal and Community Affairs, Yukon Housing Corporation and Yukon Liquor Corporation.
Hon. Meg McCall	Klondike	Minister responsible for Health and Human Resources, Education and Information Resources.

Government Members

(Progressive Conservative)

Al Falle	Hootalinqua
Doug Graham	Whitehorse Porter Creek West
Jack Hibberd	Whitehorse South Centre
Peter Hanson	Mayo
Grafton Njootli	Old Crow
Donald Taylor	Watson Lake
Howard Tracey	Tatchun

Opposition Members

(Liberal)

Ron Veale	Whitehorse Riverdale South
Alice P. McGuire	Kluane

(New Democratic Party)

Tony Penikett	Whitehorse West
---------------	-----------------

(Independent)

Maurice J. Byblow	Faro
Robert Fleming	Campbell

Clerk of Assembly	Patrick L. Michael
Clerk Assistant (Legislative)	Missy Follwell
Clerk Assistant (Administrative)	Jane Steele
Sergeant-at-Arms	G.I. Cameron
Editor of Hansard	Lois Cameron

**Whitehorse, Yukon
Wednesday, April 1, 1981**

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order.
We will proceed with Prayers.

Prayers

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed to the Order Paper.

DAILY ROUTINE

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Under Tabling of Returns and Documents, I have for tabling a report pursuant to Recommendation Number 9 of the Special Committee on Privileges.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, briefly on a question of privilege, may I call your attention and that of Members of the House, to the great occasion today of the Member for Kluane's birthday; all Members will want to congratulate her.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in those congratulations and also advise the Speaker that she is ill today.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the Annual Report of the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan, required by Section 7(1) of the *Health Care Insurance Plan Ordinance*; the Annual Report of the Hospital Insurance Plan, required by Section 8(1) of the *Hospital Insurance Ordinance*. These reports have been combined into one volume for the fiscal year April 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I also have for tabling the Annual Report of the Department of Education, 1979-80, required by Section 16(1)(b) and 16(2) of the *School Ordinance*.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I have for tabling the answer to a question asked by Mrs. McGuire on March 26, concerning mark-up of off-sales of liquor and beer.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any Reports of Special or Standing Committees?

Petitions?

Reading or Receiving of Petitions?

Introduction of Bills?

Notices of Motion for the Production of Papers?

Notices of Motion?

Statements by Ministers?

This then brings us to the Question Period. Are there any questions?

QUESTION PERIOD

Question re: White Pass & Yukon Route/Financial Assistance

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Government Leader concerning the recent comments of his good friend, John Fraser, the President of Federal Industries. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fraser has been gloating about the large profits that White Pass will make from the petroleum distribution in the Yukon Territory, and the control which that company has on transportation in the Territory. Would the Government now agree that the \$1 million loan that is going to be loaned to White Pass should be repaid at the prime bank rate of interest plus one percent—in other words the commercial rate—so that if this company is going to continue making the good profits that it has been, the Yukon taxpayers will receive value for the loan of their money?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, once again I have to reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with somewhat of an admonishment. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member had read the CTC report he would know that it was a decision of the Government of Canada that the White Pass and Yukon Corporation, for the purposes of the railway, is in fact a separate body from the other organizations owned and operated by Federal Industries in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Speaker, the CTC made that decision. It was the CTC that stated emphatically, as a result of their report, that the railway had to have assistance. It was also the CTC that said

that Government should assist them.

Now Mr. Speaker, the inference that Mr. Fraser is a friend of mine was one that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition also made.

Mr. Speaker, I met with Jack Fraser the first time he ever came to Whitehorse as the President of Federal Industries, and I sat across the table from him and promptly got into a very serious discussion about whether the White Pass should close or stay running, and whether Federal Industries indeed had any right to close it down.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a lot of friends, and I value them. Mr. Fraser is an acquaintance; I would not consider him a friend. Also the statement that he made, the supposedly "recent statement" that he made, Mr. Speaker, is in reality old news. This was two months ago, not a recent statement. This is old, old hat. Maybe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is just getting around to reading these newspapers. That was in the *Globe and Mail* a long time ago.

Now there just does not seem to be any logical reason for me to suggest to anyone, that just because this unfortunate man made this unfortunate statement, we should in any way change our desire to make sure that that railway continues operating. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is not for the benefit of White Pass or for the benefit of Federal Industries, or for the benefit of anyone outside of this Territory, that I want to see that railway operating. It has been my contention from day one, and it is still my firm belief, that it is for the benefit of this Territory and the people in it that that railroad must remain operating.

Mr. Veale: Well, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Government Leader will not commit the Government to having White Pass repay at a commercial rate of interest. Would the Government Leader agree that, in order to protect the Yukon taxpayers' loan, the repayment schedule of White Pass should be tied directly to the profit position of the company, to ensure that if the profits are going to be increasing, Yukoners will be paid for the money loaned?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member has been advised by me that this Government is in negotiations with the Government of Canada, the Government of Alaska, who is the main user of the railway, Cyprus Anvil Mines, and, indeed, the White Pass and Yukon Corporation, with respect to some sort of a loan agreement and he expects me to stand up here in front of the whole world and say what these negotiations are. That is an unreasonable request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I should inform the Government Leader that the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory recently found that the companies he mentioned were completely related companies; I hope he would bring that to the attention of Mr. Fraser in his meetings.

Would the Government Leader agree that it should be part of its negotiating position that the repayments, both in interest and principal, on the loan, be tied to the profit picture of the company?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do know that this is a factor that is being discussed in negotiations. I am not going to close off this Government's options to satisfy some whim of the Leader of the Opposition, when he really knows not of what he speaks.

Question re: Food Prices/Social Assistance

Mr. Penikett: I have a question to the Minister of Human Resources. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Department of Agriculture reported in February of this year that the cost of a nutritious food basket in Whitehorse for a family of four was more than \$400 a month. In light of the fact that food allowances for clients for the Minister's Department are less than \$300 for the same family of four, can the Minister say if it is the policy of her Department or of the Government that social assistance should at least provide sufficiently for a nutritious diet?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, our food rates compare favourably with the Agriculture Canada information. With Units III and above, we are going to look at changes there, but otherwise they compare very favourably. I have some in-

formation which I will send over to the Member that will show him our rates.

Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the Minister's answer. I wonder if she could tell me now, since she has referred to those Agriculture Canada rates, if these reports have been taken into consideration by her department when determining the levels for food allowance and if, given her answer just now, it is her intention in the future to base these rates more directly on the Agriculture Canada findings.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do take these rates into consideration when we are setting our rates. We are reviewing food rates at the moment. Food rates have been in the news, and we are looking at them very carefully. If the Member would ask me one question at a time — I cannot remember what your other questions were.

Mr. Penikett: The Minister has taken a creative leap and answered two questions in one sentence. I commend her.

I would like to ask the Minister though, as a final supplementary, if she could assure the House that the criteria by which these food assistance rates are established are not simply an arbitrary budget indicator such as the ten percent increase, but that the rates will be based in the future on need as opposed to an arbitrary budget statistic.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, the figures are realistic figures. They deal with the realities of the shopping every day. I think that the Member will find that.

Question re: Faro School Expansion

Mr. Byblow: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions of a local riding matter, the first of which I will direct to the Minister of Education. I would like to preface my question, Mr. Speaker, by noting that the Faro school expansion finally opened this week, much to the delight of some 150 students who were previously accommodated in some rather decrepit portables. My question, Mr. Speaker, seeks reassurance from the Minister that her department is closely monitoring the school situation, and is planning the necessary further expansion, in light of the rapid population growth in the community.

So, very specifically, in light of the increase of student population in the order of 100 students since last June, and in light of the anticipated increase by next September, can the Minister tell me if her department is prepared, with further expansion plans, to accommodate those increases?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the department is carefully monitoring the school situation in Faro, and has plans in the offing to cover any expansion that may be needed.

Mr. Byblow: I will direct my supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for the Yukon Housing Corporation. Can that Minister reassure me that he has plans in place to provide adequate housing for the teachers? I ask this, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the fact that there is absolutely no housing available now and in recognition, again, of the anticipated increases.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the housing situation; we are always looking at the housing situation and what is required. My department is actively working on it, and when we have made a decision I will certainly inform the Member for Faro.

Mr. Byblow: I will certainly be looking for dates from both Ministers, with respect to those needs.

I will direct my final supplementary again to the Minister responsible for Yukon Housing, in this case in his capacity as Minister of Public Works. Can he give me the reassurance that the decrepit portables I mentioned earlier will be adequately reconstructed and repaired this year, in order to accommodate the overflow anticipated for this fall, by which time I doubt if they can have a new school in place?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at these, and I am sure that we will provide the necessary rooms that the Member for Faro is requesting.

Question re: Water and Sewer Charges

Mr. Fleming: I have a question for the Government Leader this afternoon. In the Budget he was quoted as saying that he

was considering the establishment of a universal charge for water and sewer services throughout Yukon. There is a little doubt in some people's minds whether that means services, connections, or what. I wonder if the Government Leader could clarify that statement slightly?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to. I would like to sincerely thank the Honourable Member for allowing me the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, what happened was that, because of an unfortunate set of circumstances, the City of Dawson was faced with an O&M cost for their new water and sewer system, somewhere in the magnitude of about two-and-a-half times of what it was originally estimated that it was going to be. We had budgeted for a deficit for the Dawson water and sewer system, on the basis that it was going to be two-and-a-half times as little as what it is turning out to be. So we had to come to another agreement with the City of Dawson with respect to how we were going to keep the system operating.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as part of that agreement, as part of the new deficit financing that we have in place for the Dawson water and sewer system, we have an undertaking from the City of Dawson. Mr. Speaker, that undertaking is that they will not charge — because they have the ability to charge as much as or as little as they wish, being a municipality — any less than what is charged in the City of Whitehorse for water and sewer, if they are going to get this deficit financing from us. If they charge less, Mr. Speaker, then that is deducted from the deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that this is the kind of agreement with respect to deficit financing that we should be looking for, with respect to water and sewer anywhere in the Territory. Also, Mr. Speaker, I heard a lady ask in a radio broadcast whether we intended charging people who do not pay water and sewer now. No, Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not. This is for municipalities, primarily where we are involved in a deficit situation with respect to a water and sewer project.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I am now really questioning the Government Leader as to the *Local Improvement District Ordinance* where, I think it was last year, we gave the power to the Boards and the Mayors in some cases, whichever it may be, to set their own user rates. I am sure we did this. Now due to this universal thing, if the Government decides that it will be paid the same as Whitehorse, will this affect the L.I.D.s in that case, or can they still set their own rates?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, just so that no one is under any misapprehensions about this, the Municipality of Faro now charges more than what is charged in Whitehorse here. We do not have any question about that.

If we were in a deficit financing situation with Faro, under the same terms and conditions as we are with Dawson City, then it would be part of the agreement that, even if they charge less, and they can if they wish, they would have to pick up that additional money in their own tax base. They have the capability of charging their own people; they always set their own rates, Mr. Speaker.

What we are saying is: if you are going to get deficit financing from the Government of the Yukon Territory, you are at least going to pay. Everybody that is getting the benefit of that deficit financing is going to pay at least what the majority of the people in the Territory are paying for water and sewer.

Mr. Byblow: Just as a supplementary to that for clarification: could the Government Leader say whether the deficit funding that he is talking about relates only to the operation and maintenance of the facility, or does it in any way relate to the capital construction of it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I did not make that clear. We are talking strictly O&M; we are talking strictly Operation and Maintenance costs.

Question re: Trapper and Outfitter Areas/EARP

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government Leader. It has been announced that the Environmental Assessment Review Panel will be sitting once again. Will the

Government be making representations on behalf of the trappers and outfitters who have indicated that they have had their traplines or outfitting areas damaged by the Foothills cut-lines recently?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Assessment Review Panel may be sitting again. What has transpired, Mr. Speaker, was that when it was indicated to us that they may be sitting again, we advised them very emphatically that if they were going to sit again they must sit in Yukon Territory so that those people who are affected in Yukon would have an opportunity to appear before that Panel.

Mr. Speaker, it is too early for me to say automatically that we would be appearing. As everyone is well aware, we have appeared before them in the past; we have made extensive submissions to them. I honestly do not know, at this time, because, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to the Minister responsible about this for some considerable length of time now. The last time that we did talk about it was when we had the fears that they were going to sit in Ottawa or somewhere else and consider what might or might not be done in the Yukon Territory. We advised them, at that time, very emphatically, that we felt that if they were going to do this they should sit in Yukon. I have not heard anything back from them.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, could the Government Leader indicate whether, in the event that the Government does not participate itself, it will be giving technical support from its various departments to the individual Yukoners who will be appearing before the Panel, making claims of damages and disruption?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, and as far as I have witnessed personally, we provide as much technical support, particularly to the trapping people, as we possibly can in this Government. We have people whose jobs are dedicated to supplying technical support to the trappers in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, in the cases where damage is being done and trappers are losing some of their livelihood, will the Government be compensating these trappers directly with other traplines, or by expanding existing traplines?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, once again it is something that is going to have to be looked at, when and if it happens. Certainly it would be a request that would be received sympathetically by this Government. Exactly what could be done about it is a question. There is not very much of the Yukon Territory that is considered to be suitable for traplines that is not, in fact, under trapline lease at this point in time.

Question re: Squatters

Mr. Penikett: I am sure the Government Leader will soon be trapping my Order Paper questions from last fall on this subject. I have a question now to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Minister recently replied to one of my letters concerning a long standing grievance from a constituent who, through no fault of his own, became a squatter. Could the Minister state now, for the record, what action he is taking with the City of Whitehorse to solve this problem, for people in my constituency who are technically squatters but who do not wish to remain so?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of problems with the squatter situation throughout the Territory. In this particular area inside the City of Whitehorse, the City is not going to make spot solutions. We are looking at the class of squatters in this particular area, as a group; we are working very diligently to review them all, and re-zone that particular area. When the area has been re-zoned, we hope to be able to offer the land for sale to these people.

At this time, negotiations are going on. What the outcome will be, I am not able to say at this particular time, but I am hopeful that in the near future, we will solve the squatter problem in this area.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get this Minister to confirm that the approach he has indicated is the one that he intends to use wherever there is a squatter prob-

lem? That is, giving people the option to buy land where the residential use is common to their area.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to say exactly in every particular case that this would be so. Mr. Speaker, I would tend to believe that the principle would be utilized in all of these areas. I believe that, in the squatter situation, there is no easy solution for the whole thing. I think we have to group people together. I think the basic philosophy in trying to solve this squatter problem, Mr. Speaker, is that everybody be treated fairly. There is no preference given to one person over another, and I think that, by using that particular philosophy, we will solve this problem in a manner that will be fair to everybody.

Mr. Penikett: Could I ask the Minister if he would be prepared to recommend the eminently sensible solution that he has proposed in the Kyle case as a precedent, or as a principle, for resolution of similar cases wherever they may exist in this City?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I should make it a precedent. I do think though that the basic philosophy of trying to come up with a solution that solves this problem in fairness to all the people, will be the guiding principle that we will use in trying to solve the squatter problem.

Question re: Teslin School on Indian Land

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. I think she will know of what I am speaking, because I mentioned it to her earlier. It is regarding the school in Teslin, where that school was presumably built on Indian Reserve Land without proper authority, possibly — maybe yes, maybe no. There are some negotiations going on now, apparently. I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date on where those negotiations are between the Band, the Federal Government, and Government of the Yukon Territory?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the YTG school is on Indian Band property, and this is causing an administrative sort of problem that has to be solved. My officials are meeting with the Band officials and the Band lawyer in the next few days to try to finally resolve it.

Mr. Fleming: In other words, the Minister is monitoring this from day to day and keeping a good tab on it, I presume?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are, indeed.

Mr. Fleming: This first part of my supplementary may be slightly hypothetical, Mr. Speaker; however, the second will not be.

In the case of a breakdown of these negotiations and any emergency arising, are the Minister and the Government preparing themselves for this type of thing that might happen, by any chance? In other words, are you ready to protect the people and their children if the school still carries on, without too much of a delay, if something happens?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Dear me, Mr. Speaker, we are not anticipating any emergency; we expect that we can negotiate that fairly and come to an amicable arrangement before too long. Should an emergency arise, I think we will be prepared to deal with it.

Question re: Progressive Conservative Party Speech Writer

Mr. Byblow: I have a question I will direct to the Government Leader, in order to clarify a number of rumours abounding about the building. Could the Government Leader inform the House whether or not he has in the past contracted, or is presently contracting, the services of the former speech writer for the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea about whom he is talking.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Government Leader, then, confirm or deny whether his office has contracted the services of a Mr. David Humphreys?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I have no problem; yes, Mr. Speaker, in fact one of the reasons that we feel so strongly that we need an office in Ottawa is that we found it necessary, during the course of the year, to enter into a contract with Mr. Humphreys to act

on our behalf on a number of matters in the Ottawa area.

Mr. Byblow: Could the Government Leader then confirm whether or not this particular speech writer, Mr. Humphreys, recently gave a seminar to a group of Deputy Heads and Ministers on Political Public Relations?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to confirm that at all. I think we should get a couple of things straight. Mr. Humphreys was the managing editor of the *Calgary Albertan* and the *Ottawa Journal* for ten years. Secondly, he happens to be the former Executive Assistant of the former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Mr. Jake Epp, somewhat akin to the former post of the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West. He has that in his past history, being an executive assistant to a Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Humphreys has a firm in Ottawa; he is in the business of acting for various governments. This is not the only government he acts for; he acts for any number of governments on any number of things. Mr. Speaker, we have been told time and time and time and time again, that this Government does not disseminate enough information to the public. Mr. Humphreys was in Edmonton on other business, and we asked him to come up here and spend a day with the Cabinet and with the Deputy Ministers, and tell us how we can properly disseminate information to the public: Mr. Speaker, how we can — not politically, but publicly — disseminate this information.

Question re: Retail Trade North of 60

Mr. Penikett: I am certainly glad the Government Leader is doing his bit for the tourist industry. I knew Mr. Humphreys was in town because I saw numerous references to his latest book, *The Pearson Years*; actually its "person-years" I see, throughout the Budget.

Let me ask a question to the Government Leader about reality. Statistics Canada has just reported, Mr. Speaker, that retail trade north of 60 dropped drastically in January to February — by 21 per cent to be exact. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is aware of this report.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen it yet.

Mr. Penikett: I am sure the Government Leader will be wanting to see it as soon as possible, and when he does look for it, I wonder if he would advise the House if his officials have apprised or will apprise him on the validity of this report, and whether, in their expert opinion, it is an accurate picture of the retail trade situation in Yukon?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we had before this House, in this Legislature, a piece of legislation called the *Statistics Ordinance*, that was going to allow us to participate with Statistics Canada. Mr. Speaker, we are not in the business of second guessing Statistics Canada; in fact, I do not know if we can even talk to them anymore. It was deemed that that piece of legislation should not be proceeded with, and we have a very difficult situation with Statistics Canada. We have no way of inputting to them, nor do we have any way of second guessing them.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I say again I was more than pleased to strike a blow for freedom in opposing that bill.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if the Minister has any explanation as to whether the figures are accurate for the decline, given that the seasonally adjusted figures for southern Canada show an increase in retail trade rather than a decline.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, and, frankly, it takes me by somewhat of a surprise, because it has been my perception from the people whom I have talked to on the streets in Whitehorse, particularly since the beginning of the year, that things have turned around very dramatically and have become an awful lot better in Whitehorse, and in the Territory generally. So, I am a bit surprised.

Question re: Wolf Creek Youth Centre/Disposal of Building

Mr. Veale: I have a question for the Minister in charge of the Board of Survey. It has come to light that the Wolf Creek — the Minister is not here? Perhaps I could put it to the Govern-

ment Leader, then, as the Chief Executive Officer of the Government.

The Wolf Creek Youth Centre is going to be disposed of in some fashion by the Government, perhaps at some time later in this year when the juvenile training moves out of that centre. My question is: will the Cabinet or will the Board of Survey, as normally happens, be in charge of the disposal of that building?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the Board of Survey is a board that is set up in this Government which determines whether capital assets of this Government should be disposed of when they are no longer of any use to this Government. Then, Mr. Speaker, it determines how they should be disposed of. There are a number of methods: public tender, public auction, over the dump; the Board of Survey then makes recommendations to the Cabinet and that is dealt with as a Finance item.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, my question is whether the Board of Survey, depending on what method is chosen, will actually handle disposal of the building.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, I thought I just explained quite explicitly what the Board of Survey does. The Board of Survey makes a determination of whether any capital asset — no matter what it might be, from a building to a typewriter — is of any further use to this Government. It then makes a recommendation as to whether it should be disposed of and how it should be disposed of. That is where their actions begin and end.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, will the Government, to avoid another Whitehorse Credit Union real estate sale, give a commitment that, in the disposal of assets by this Government, there will be both an upset price and a second tender if that upset price is not obtained on the first tender?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, not at all.

Question re: Medical Fees

Mr. Penikett: I have a question for the Government Leader. Last week, the Government Leader said that the official position of his Government is one opposed to extra billing, opting out, and balance billing, in connection with Medicare policy; I commend the Government for taking such a position.

Could he now indicate if his Government has taken a position on the controversial question of compulsory arbitration, in fee negotiations with the medical profession?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. We are still in negotiations with the medical profession and have not seen any indication yet to harden our position or to look to other alternatives in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Speaker, for the last ten years, I believe it is now, Yukon has been able to come to an agreement with the medical profession with respect to the delivery of these services. I am very hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we can come to that agreement again, in the normal course of events.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is not extraordinary that April 1 is coming and going without there being an agreement with the medical profession.

I believe that probably the norm is that it is usually May or June before that agreement is finally reached; then, of course, it is made retroactive to April 1.

Mr. Penikett: I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that the wise position is for one to avoid concluding a contract on April 1.

I would like to ask a supplementary to the Minister of Health on the same subject. Given the importance of the Hall Report to health care for all Canadians, would the Minister be prepared, during this Session of the Legislature, to make a Ministerial Statement to the House, so that all Yukoners can be apprised of this Government's position with respect to this important report and its many substantial recommendations?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, the findings of the Hall Report are open to the public; it is a public report. I do not know that this Government is prepared to make a statement as to their views.

Mr. Penikett: If not, Mr. Speaker, that would be most re-

grettable. Let me ask the Minister another supplementary. Since the confusion about this Government's position on the Hall Report came from a report of the mouthings of an Alberta Cabinet Minister, would our Minister at least — failing a ministerial statement which I still hope would be forthcoming — undertake to advise Alberta of Yukon's true position on this Report?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Speaker, no one in Alberta has asked me for such a report, and I have no intention of giving such a report. I think the Member will find that individual Members have different views on the many recommendations and suggestions in the Hall Report. It is a vast report. There is no way that one person could speak on the Hall Report for this entire Government.

Question re: Faro School Expansion (Continued)

Mr. Byblow: I have a question that I will direct to the Minister of Public Works, on the same subject that I raised earlier. As the Minister is aware, the expansion of the school that recently opened has suffered a serious foundation problem: namely the sinking of the footings for the gymnasium. Can the Minister advise me on the matter of the responsibility for that deficiency, and who is undertaking any corrective or stabilizing measures for the structure?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: On this particular school that we are talking about, the defects were first noted in December of this year. In January of this year, it was reaffirmed that they had increased somewhat. We had our own engineers look at it; we have been monitoring it very well. We have detected no further deterioration in this cracking process. My department has told me that we have engaged a set of engineers to look it over. We have monitored it each week and there has been no difference in the last short while. We are going to continue to monitor it, and if it does not increase, the engineers have assured us that there is no permanent damage.

Mr. Byblow: I gather from the Minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for the structure now rests with the Department of Highways and Public Works. Is that correct? I ask that with regard to whether or not the contractor has any obligation, or whether the consultant who specified the foundation for the building has any obligation. Could the Minister clarify the matter of responsibility? Does it solely now rest with Highways and Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Speaker, on this particular structural defect, if you want to call it that, the engineer from the company that built the school was with our own engineers when we inspected it. As I say we are monitoring it. I do not think it has been determined if it is their responsibility or not, at this particular time.

Mr. Byblow: I thank the Minister for clarifying that there is some problem with respect to the responsibility. Was the Minister able to ascertain whether or not the consultant design specs for the foundation were recommended for change, and did change, as a result of his engineering department's advice?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, I am not aware of any such thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The time allotted for the Question Period has now gone by, so we will go to Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Mr. Clerk: Item Number one, standing in the name of Mr. Veale.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item One?

Mr. Veale: I would ask that that matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Next sitting day? So ordered.

Mr. Clerk: Item number two, standing in the name of Mr. Tracey.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item two?

Mr. Tracey: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 6

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Tatchun, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that pursuant to Subsection 12(1) of the *Yukon Act* it is the recommendation of this Assembly that the Honourable E. Geoffrey Lattin be appointed to the Advisory Committee on Finance.

Mr. Tracey: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question has been called. Are you agreed?

Some Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Item number three, standing in the name of Mr. Falle.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with Item three?

Mr. Falle: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 7

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Hootalinqua, seconded by the Honourable Member for Old Crow, that the Standing Committee on Rules, Elections and Privileges, consider and make recommendations to the Yukon Legislative Assembly on the salaries, indemnities, and allowances of Members of the Yukon Legislative Assembly, including those of the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and Members of the Executive Council.

Mr. Falle: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question has been called. Are you agreed?

Mr. Veale: Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called.

Mr. Clerk: could you kindly poll the House?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Njootli: Agreed.

Mr. Hanson: Agreed.

Mr. Graham: Agreed.

Mr. Falle: Agreed.

Mr. Tracey: Agreed.

Mr. Veale: Disagree.

Mr. Penikett: Disagree.

Mr. Fleming: Disagree.

Mr. Byblow: Disagree.

Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are eight "yea"; four "nay".

Motion agreed to

Mr. Clerk: Item number four, standing in the name of Mr. Hanson.

Mr. Speaker: Is the Honourable Member prepared to deal with item four?

Mr. Hanson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion Number 8

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Mayo, seconded by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, that this House opposes the contents of Bill C-48, the *Canada Oil and Gas Act*, which is currently under debate in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak too long on this motion, because it reminds me of a Private Member's motion that I brought up some two years ago, when the Members across the floor were all hollering, "Don't do it! Don't do it!" I am probably going to get the same reaction today, I do not doubt it. I well remember the Honourable Member for Faro standing up and debating, "the cost, the cost, the cost"; "what it is going to cost the taxpayers". He had not even read the motion. If he had read the motion, it suggested that we take over the administration, planning and funding of our resources, but the Honourable Member had a list that he had procured from somewhere, of all the costs for the take-over of our resources in Yukon; however he had not bothered to read the motion that was in front of him.

The Honourable Member for Whitehorse West got up. I will remember some of the things that the Honourable Member said, and this one was, "It has never happened before so it cannot happen now. It will never be allowed to happen." Yet, Mr. Speaker, I am sure today, when he looks at C-48, he realizes they did it to us before, and they are doing it to us again, and we must be the best in Canada.

Now, the new Member, the Leader of the Opposition: it is not too hard to realize where he is going to be — in somewhat the same position as the former Leader of the Opposition was: "Ottawa knows best."

So, Mr. Speaker, I have waited two years to get a whack at some of these fellows across the floor on this subject, and unfortunately I cannot say all that I really want to say.

Bill C-48, along with the Mobility Clause, will show you what Ottawa intends to do. They intend to have the biggest land grab in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, and not only that. Under the Mobility Clause, they do not even have to guarantee that any Yukoner would be able to work on our natural resources, because they own them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am kind of anxious to hear the attitude of the Members opposite; particularly the new Member because he has pretty well already agreed to support Ottawa to the utmost, forgetting that he is living in Yukon. I wish him well in his ambitions to become the Senator from Toronto, but at the present time he should remember that he was elected in Yukon.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member has proposed a motion dealing with something called Bill C-48, the *Canada Oil and Gas Act*. It is traditional, I understand, Mr. Speaker, for proposers of motions to explain something about the substance of their resolution. I wonder if it would be appropriate to ask the Member to do that; otherwise it would be impossible to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker: I must say that the Honourable Member has no point of order.

Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to Motion Number 8, as put by my Honourable colleague with regard to Bill C-48. As we all know, it introduces another monster into the northern part of Canada. We know that Mr. Lalonde, who is the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, is interested in the 2.5 million square miles of northern Canada's offshore areas. This manoeuvre, Mr. Speaker, would benefit the southern markets and not particularly the north, so I make an urgent request — and I am sure the Opposition will agree with me — that it is for us to act diligently and quickly before this piece of legislation is implemented in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the northern governments are not in agreement with Bill C-48. The Native Organization in the North does not agree with it either. Let me give you an example. I would like to quote from the *Hansard* of the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly on February 19, where we have a very prominent native Indian person, who is the leader of the Dene Nation, and who appeared before the Committee of the Whole in that particular Legislature. On page 552 of that *Hansard* report, he says:

"The position of the Dene Nation is that this new bill will have a dramatic effect on the future of northern Canada. It will have an effect on Newfoundland, British Columbia and other provinces that also have offshore. It will have a dramatic effect on Northwest Territories and on the Yukon particularly because we are not yet provinces."

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say, at the bottom of the page: "I cannot understand how we can be talking about sharing in royalties, et cetera, when we are completely ignoring control of our resources."

I would like to go on and say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not personally think that the Chamber of Mines would like this particular bill. The Alberta Government has cut back on oil production

under this type of program, since Lalonde has launched the program in relation to the Federal Liberal Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill has about seven elements, and we do not totally agree with any one of them. In all fairness, I urge the House to object to the bill.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the bill shows a total disregard for our constitutional input by the Yukon residents — whether they are Indian or white, Liberal, NDP or Conservative — and it shows no energy supplies at reasonable prices to the Territorial residents, once it has been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the economic future of our Territory is going to be affected by this particular Bill, and again, unanimous support from the Honourable Member for Mayo's motion should be implemented as soon as possible and sent to Ottawa, so that the Standing Committee on Natural Resources can hear our position.

One of the drastic things that I think the bill will do is to totally destroy the ability of the Yukon Government, the Council for Yukon Indians, and the Federal Government to negotiate Yukon Indian claims; because, inside these claims, we have various lands set aside for native people, and various land set aside for Yukoners and Federal Government.

If this particular bill is going to come into effect, I would assume it would create more conflicts in the North. It is just another divide-and-conquer tactic, and that is why I call it a monster, a monster in Northern Canada; it is going to cause more conflict between various groups in these particular claims.

I sincerely hope that Bill C-48 will be amended before it becomes law, so that our legitimate concerns can be registered and enshrined into this bill, whether it is in constitutional debate in Supreme Court or in the House of Commons. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, probably for reasons different from the Members opposite. I, personally, as a Canadian, am fully in favour of the National Energy Program of the Government of Canada, but I object strenuously to the implementation of that program in this particular piece of legislation.

The first point I think, Mr. Speaker, is that the legislation does not in any way incorporate resource revenue sharing agreements or negotiations that are taking place with Yukoners today, and that should be a part of that bill. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is an incredible wide-open ministerial discretion which usually ends up being exercised by an Ottawa bureaucrat. I object strongly to those particular discretions in that bill.

Finally, the bill is designed to incredibly increase the exploration in the Beaufort Sea. The pace of that exploration is going to be expanded incredibly. At the same time the bill makes very inadequate provision for environmental protection, and the two are very much in conflict.

So, the wording of the particular motion does not excite me all that much, because there are some aspects of it that I could say were okay, but basically I am in agreement that the bill should be sent back and re-written.

Mr. Fleming: I could either rise in support or otherwise of this motion, but I would like to say a few words first. Regardless of how the motion goes today in this House, I do not think it will mean much to the Parliament in Ottawa, and I am saying this across the board. It would not make any difference whether there was a Liberal Government, a Progressive Conservative Government, or an NDP Government. We happen to be the small people out here, and they are not going to pay too much attention. However, I think we, in all cases, wish to protect our rights and to gain what rights we feel we should have, that we may not have now.

Therefore, and to keep the Honourable Member happy, I will support his motion at this time. I think he has done a good job in putting it forward.

Mr. Tracey: Mr. Speaker, I also have to rise in support of the motion. I have to get back to the constitutional aspect of it.

Under our existing Constitution, if the Yukon were to become a province, we would have control, or should have the control of those resources. If Bill C-48 is brought in, we will never see the day when we will control our own resources.

I also remember Jean Chretien's statement of a few years back, when he said, "The resources of the North are worth too much for the people up there to own them. They belong to all Canadians". I think this is a carry-on of that attitude by the Federal Government. We do not even share in the oil and gas resources that are being taken out of the Yukon today. We have absolutely no revenue coming from our oil and gas which is leaving us from our Kotanelee Field in south-eastern Yukon. So I would support this motion, and I am very happy to hear that the Members across the floor are almost unanimously going to support us.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this motion, because contrary to what the Honourable Member for Campbell might think, I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that what he has said in this House, and what is transmitted to Ottawa on behalf of this House, is very important. It is looked at, and unless we continue to say the things that must be said, nothing is ever going to happen. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I hear the Honourable Member say that he does not think that what we do here makes any difference any more, because he did not always think that way and I hope that we can change his mind. Do not ever lose sight of the fact that what we do say is well looked at.

But, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition reel off all the reasons why he did not like this bill, but I did not hear him say one of the major reasons he did not like the bill — because what it does is take away the top 25 percent of all the oil and gas resources in the Yukon Territory from the people of Yukon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Government of Canada holds those resources in trust for the people of Yukon; that some day they must become ours, if we are to become first class citizens in Canada. This is just another one of the indications we have from the Government of the day in Ottawa, that people in the northern part of this country just simply do not matter to them. Our aspirations do not mean anything to them. They are not even going to be concerned about them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the lack of concern is such that the Standing Committee of the House of Commons that is dealing with this issue — which is a very contentious one as far as we are concerned, in fact the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development is in Ottawa now and will be appearing on behalf of the people of the Territory before that Committee tomorrow — made a decision, some days ago, that it was going to travel in the North and that it was going to hear from the people of the North. It made that decision, Mr. Speaker, after hearing submissions primarily from the Native organizations in Northern Canada. They heard their submissions. They made a decision that they were going to travel in the North and hear from the people who are going to be directly affected by this bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report to this House that yesterday the Committee reversed that decision. It must be pointed out that the Liberals voted against travelling, the Conservative and NDP Members voted for travelling. I must also say that one of the NDP Members was so upset that he walked out of the Committee. He was to be commended for it. I, too, Mr. Speaker, am upset that that was done. It was obvious that the Members of the Liberal Party on that Committee did not have their marching orders straight from the Minister. But, boy, he sure gave them to them. He told them to get back there and get that thing straightened out. He did not want this Committee travelling in the North. He is not interested at all in what we have to say in the North with respect to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of people in northern Canada who are concerned about this Bill. The Government of the Northwest Territories convened a meeting of a number of organizations and people a couple of weeks ago in Yellowknife

to discuss this matter. They came up with a resolution, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to read the whereas-es of that resolution to this House so that we know exactly, as the Honourable Member for Whitehorse West said, what we are talking about: what the parameters of this bill are, and how they affect us.

"WHEREAS the Government of Canada is currently vested with the adequate powers to provide for Canada's energy needs and northern resource development within present legislation and regulations;

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has a special responsibility for northern territorial development which it has exercised in the past as trustees for future provinces;

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has a responsibility as a trustee for aboriginal peoples and lands in which they have legitimate interests;

"AND WHEREAS Bill C-48 is based on principles which preclude the present and future rights of the residents of northern territories;

"AND WHEREAS Bill C-48 precludes the establishment of political and constitutional rights of Northern peoples to ownership and control of natural resources which are guaranteed for Canadians in all the provinces of Canada;

"AND WHEREAS the measures contained in Bill C-48 will prejudice the negotiations and settlement of aboriginal rights;

"AND WHEREAS the measures contained in Bill C-48 establish an unacceptable precedent for the extension of this type of legislation into mining and renewable resources development in the northern territories;

"AND WHEREAS Bill C-48 erodes the present legislative mandate of northern institutions of government over social, economic and environmental matters as they relate to oil and gas development, and prejudices further transfers of northern governments of additional authority to these areas;

"AND WHEREAS Bill C-48 grants the authority to a Minister of the Crown to proceed with development without employing the review processes required under present legislation and Cabinet policy to examine the social, economic and environmental impacts of the development;

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Northern Leaders Conference firmly opposes the proposed Bill C-48."

Mr. Speaker, everyone of these "whereas-es", everyone of those concerns, is a very, very valid one.

Mr. Speaker, for those who do not understand it, what this bill will do is to take away, forever, 25 percent of what is really something that the people of this Territory should own in perpetuity. We strongly believe in the ownership of resources for the people of Canada, and that those resources should be owned by the people in the provinces. But we also, along with that, Mr. Speaker, believe in equalization payments. It is not a fair or true statement, and it is not based on any kind of fact at all, that, because Yukon happens to be very rich in resources, those resources should belong to all of Canada in perpetuity. In fact if we, as first class Canadians, own those resources, they do belong to all of Canada and there cannot be any argument about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is very very important. I intend to support the motion, and I also intend to call for a division on the motion, because I feel that we must have every Member's recorded vote with respect to this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate? Are you prepared for the Question?

Some Members: Division.

Mr. Speaker: Division has been called. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly poll the House?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Agreed.

Mr. Njootli: Agreed.

Mr. Hanson: Agreed.

Mr. Graham: Agreed.

Mr. Falle: Agreed.
Mr. Tracey: Agreed.
Mr. Veale: Agreed.
Mr. Penikett: Agreed.
Mr. Fleming: Agreed.
Mr. Byblow: Agreed.
Mr. Clerk: Mr. Speaker, the results are 12 "yea", no "nay".
Motion agreed to
Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed to Public Bills and Orders other than Government Bills and Orders.

BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 101, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to proceed, since the House is in such a unanimous mood, but I ask it be next sitting day.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

Mr. Clerk: Second reading, Bill Number 102, standing in the name of Mr. Penikett.

Mr. Penikett: Next sitting day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: So ordered.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. Chairman: I will call the Committee of the Whole to order at this time.

I would like to call a short recess.

Recess

Bill No. 5: Second Appropriation Ordinance (1981-82)

Mr. Chairman: I call the Committee of the Whole to order at this time. The Chair would like to direct the Members to page 84, Rehabilitation Services, which was not carried yesterday.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two bits of information on this Budget that I would like to give before we finish, if I may. Mr. Veale was questioning the decrease to foster homes to \$100 from \$400. Foster homes are a resource for placing. This does not indicate the number of foster homes in actual use. The number of foster homes available to us as a resource is more than the number of children placed in a foster home. Therefore, the fact that we have four foster homes fewer available to us is insignificant. Does that answer the question?

I have some figures on the Rehabilitation Center. It is found under training, Page 84. There is \$140,000 for rehabilitation; that includes salaries which is the largest amount. It also includes utilities, travel, office supplies, staff training and mortgage.

Mr. Veale: Training is \$184,400.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: \$140,000 is included under training for the Rehabilitation Center. That is where the O&M for the Rehab Center is. Did you get those figures? \$140,000 includes salaries, utilities, travel, office supplies, staff training, and mortgage.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions on rehabilitation? Being no further discussion, shall the program Administration of Health Services carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Rehabilitation Services Program cleared.

I would like to direct the Committee to Page 86, under Administration of Health Services Program; you will find your sta-

tistics on the following page, Page 87. Do you have any questions?

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, will Pharmacare come under this area?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I should think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Veale: Is Pharmacare budgeted for in this Budget?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, Mr. Chairman, it will have to come in as a supplementary.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate when it would be the intention of the Minister to introduce Pharmacare?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, far from taking a long time with Pharmacare, the people in Ottawa are very surprised that we would even think of having legislation ready by the Fall Session. We will have the White Paper on Pharmacare ready for this Session.

I cannot give a date, but I would imagine that Pharmacare could come into effect — Well, we will have the legislation for the Fall Session, so you can sort of judge from that. We are pretty sure to have it for the Fall Session. They are working very hard on it.

Mr. Veale: The reason that I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, is that there was a perception in the community from the resolution in the last Fall Session that pharmacare was *fait accompli* and was going to be introduced almost immediately. I think that there are some people who have been taken aback by the delays.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I think that is really due to the fact that people do not realize that to bring in a Pharmacare program is a huge undertaking. It is like bringing in a Medicare program in the first place; you just do not do it overnight. So, actually, we have gone very speedily with it; it is coming along very very quickly. As I said, the Federal people are surprised that we would think that we could have it into legislation by the Fall Session.

Mr. Veale: Is there any timeframe on the Pharmacare White Paper?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Well, it should be coming out pretty soon. It will certainly be in this Session.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion on this program? Shall the program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Administration of Health Services Program cleared.

Mr. Chairman: I would now like to refer Committee to the General Health program, which is located on Page 88, with statistics on Page 89.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate the number of person-years in the "Dental" area, for school-aged children?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The number of dental people providing services? I do not think I have the exact figure for that.

No, I do not have the exact number of dental people. I could provide that for the Member.

Mr. Veale: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, it appears that there has been no increase in person-years in any event, with the exception of the speech therapist-audiologist. Will the Minister explain, then, the increase in the Budget from 1980-81 to 1981-82, for both the dental and the mental health areas?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, just the increases due to the spiralling costs in the health field. Just spiralling costs in general and improved services to communities, in some cases, of the dental program. Otherwise it is just rising costs.

Mr. Veale: Well, could the Minister indicate, in the rising costs, what portion would be for salaries and what portion would be the actual provision of services or items? I mean, is it including gold fillings or something? Is there some explanation? The increase seems to be quite a bit larger than the general wage increases that have taken place.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the Member realizes that these are all Federal. This is federally directed and signed and so on. It is another one of the problems that we have with the Federal Government. We have no control in here.

Mr. Veale: Well, this really concerns me. Is the Minister not monitoring what the Federal Government is doing, in some fashion?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Well, it is a continuing battle, I am afraid. We monitor it as much as we can but there is nothing we can do. They present it to us. This is the high-handed attitude of Ottawa. After a long time protesting, we have an agreement now with Monique Begin, the Minister of Health and Welfare Canada, where they agreed now to work with us a little more closely. But this has been after a long battle.

Mr. Veale: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; that is what I wanted to hear from the Minister. Could she elaborate on the arrangement that she has with the Federal Health Minister to negotiate these matters more closely, or at least to debate the subject before the expenditures are incurred?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, indeed I can. Our officials, at long last, are to be invited along when members of CYI and the Federal people get together to plan our Budget, and, at long last, we are going to be consulted on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Fleming: Just to carry it a little further; for instance, the health centres and the health stations are Federal, and in our Budget here you say they are Federal. What do we actually pay for, at those health stations? Are we paying rental on them? On what basis do we pay?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, we pay 70 percent; that is our share of the total cost.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister discuss the specialist clinics, and what that actually covers? It does not appear that there is going to be any increase in those. As a matter of fact, it does not even deal with 1981-82 in terms of projection of specialist clinics. Is that something that is completely out of the Minister's control?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, I am afraid it is completely out of my control, Mr. Chairman. We encourage from the sidelines as much as we can, but it is out of our control.

Mr. Chairman: Further discussion? There being no further discussion, shall the program, General Health, carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that the General Health Program is cleared.

I would like to refer Committee to the Yukon Hospital Insurance Services, located on Page 90; there are statistics on the following page. Discussion?

Mr. Fleming: I presume, now, this is in the same vein. The Whitehorse General Hospital, for instance, is a Federal institution, and we are paying so much a day for patients in there. We pay 70 percent of the total cost of the operation, in other words?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Veale: Does the Minister have any statistics on the actual occupation of the number of beds in the Whitehorse General Hospital, for example?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: They are available from the federal people, Mr. Chairman. I do not have any, no.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister advise us how the per capita cost of insured services, \$313.33, compares with other jurisdictions in the country?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I cannot say off-hand, Mr. Chairman. I think they are probably comparable; I can check that for the Member.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the program clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that Yukon Hospital Insurance Services clear.

I refer the Committee to the following Page 92, to the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan. You will find your statistics on Page 93.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, my question is: the revenue generation has basically tripled some health care premiums and doubled others; how has it been estimated what the actual cost has been? Is there a possibility that the Minister has over-estimated what the costs are going to be? Are those all fixed

costs that have to be met?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Department of Finance arrived at those figures. Perhaps I will let the Finance Minister answer.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, because it became so evident to us so quickly that there was going to have to be a dramatic increase this year; because the first figures that we saw were really, really dramatic; we asked the Department of Health and Human Resources and the Department of Finance to sit down, and, very carefully, using the best information that they could gather, to re-estimate their costs for the current year.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of health care just simply has gone up that much. It will become obvious what we had to do was play a bit of catch-up as well, and that is part of the reason for the big jump this year. Obviously Mr. Chairman, we did not charge enough last year. As a consequence, we have a supplementary estimate of some magnitude that will come before this House. It reflects directly back. We just simply did not estimate; we did not foresee, nor do I think anyone in Canada foresaw, the dramatic rise in the delivery of health services during the course of one year.

Mr. Chairman, if I could just add one word to what the Honourable Minister has said, with respect to the Department of National Health and Welfare and our 70 percent share. Mr. Chairman, we received an indication from them that they needed a supplementary estimate from us, just for the year — this is a supplementary estimate — of \$3 million, just for their operation in the Yukon Territory. That will give you some idea of how quickly their costs rose. This was in less than one year; they were \$3 million behind.

So, the costs have been worked out realistically. We have looked at what we hope that we know our costs to National Health and Welfare are going to be, based on what they have given us here. We know what we are going to get from the Federal Government for Established Programs Funding, and how much of our block funding is designed to offset those costs; the difference is what is reflected here. We knew virtually to the penny how much money we had to raise via premiums in order to make health care pay for itself.

Mr. Fleming: This is the age-old question again. I do not expect the Minister to have this information today; but maybe she can get it for me, of how we are actually doing in our collection of outstanding debts that we had last year; how much we have collected, how much is left outstanding; if she could get that some time when it is possible to get that. If she does not have it right now, it is fine.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, no, I do not have the figures with me, but I will provide those for the Member.

Mr. Fleming: I have another question, along the line of awareness to the public in the Yukon Territory, as to what your Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan actually covers. Of course, I stand here again, right in the spot where I have actually — well, I am actually going to have to pay some more money now, most likely, for hospitalization than I did in another country, the United States.

I am just wondering: is there, through your department, any thought of advertising it a little more strongly across the Territory, so that people really know exactly what that Medicare Card will cover, and how much it will cover?

Hospital expenses will cover just exactly what you have to pay over here, \$217 a day, or whatever it is. It is \$500 in New York and if you land in there, you will pay the rest. It is very simple to get insurance for yourself, and I will say it is very cheap because I had it for about six or seven months and it did not cost me anymore than about \$40. The month that I ended up in the hospital I forgot to get it, and here I am.

So, I would like a little explanation of that, and if you are trying to make people aware.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister for her permission to answer on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, when we come to Government Services in the Budget, you will see a fair increase in the allocation of monies

to that Department, for advertising and public relations. This is primarily to try to really put some emphasis, during the course of this year, on the programs that this Government has available for the people in the Territory. Hopefully, we will be able to get out this very kind of information, so that people do become aware of what is available, because, Mr. Chairman, it has been our perception that people simply do not know what this Government is about — what kind of services it does provide to the people in the Territory. We are hopeful that we can make it clear to them as to what services are available, because we do not have very much to apologize for, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Fleming: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am very, very happy to hear the Government Leader say those words, because, thinking of myself and where I am in this position, I should know, but I did not really know. This type of program, I think, is going to be worthwhile and I thank you.

Mr. Veale: Does the Minister have any breakdown in terms of the percentage of people who are single and the percentage who are couples?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: We have those figures, Mr. Chairman. I do not have them with me, but we have them and can provide them.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, there has been a number of areas where the Minister has not had things at her fingertips. Will there be some timeframe on the replies to those?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we can have them by Friday, I would think, at the very latest.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, just a question of information: the out-of-Territory claims and costs per claim, and I presume we are talking now about Alberta and British Columbia; when a medical service is provided in British Columbia, by a British Columbian doctor, whether the person is sent out or that doctor comes up here, by what fee schedule is that doctor being paid?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: By the Yukon fee schedule, or, if the treatment is outside, by the fee schedule of wherever they are — Alberta or BC.

Mr. Veale: What is the difference, generally speaking, between the fee schedules of doctors in the Yukon, doctors in BC, and doctors in Alberta?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, there really has not been any. The fees in the Yukon were traditionally 20 percent higher.

Mr. Veale: My question is: what about Alberta and BC? How do they line up? I suppose what I am asking is, if one or other of the other provinces is cheaper, that is certainly a way of cost-cutting.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: As far as I know, there is not any discrepancy worth noting between Alberta and BC, or has not been.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Chairman, if I might, it is not really the answer or anything, but I was just reading it the other day; I do not remember the exact figures, but I can remember that the exact figure for New Brunswick is \$480 a year. Alberta — if I am not mistaken, it was either Alberta or BC — was \$207 per year, one dollar more than our own. I read it.

Mr. Veale: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the Minister to undertake to check into that. We have been talking a lot in generalities. Just in terms of the difference in the fee schedules in British Columbia and in Alberta, if they are like real estate prices, there may be some discrepancy, and it may be a method of the Government's reducing health premiums.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I have taken no part at all in the present negotiations with medical fees, and I really prefer to stay away from them altogether. It could be perceived as a conflict of interest on my part, so I do not discuss this.

Mr. Veale: I appreciate the Minister's position. Would the Government Leader undertake to do that — he does not have a medical conflict, does he?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman, but I would respectfully point out to the Honourable Member that the BC fee

schedule is under negotiation at this present time. It has not been agreed to yet. I understand today that it is likely to go to arbitration, so hopefully we can avoid that. But, we have available to us, for instance, the fee schedules from all across Canada for last year. That is no problem. We can certainly give that information to the Honourable Member. But, Mr. Chairman, I hope he is not suggesting that we should send someone to Alberta instead of to BC if it is going to be cheaper. That is not what you are suggesting, are you?

Mr. Veale: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what I am suggesting, if in fact it is cheaper, and the medical service is of precisely the same quality, why would we not take advantage of it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that. But the first criterion, always, with respect to medical evacuations, for this Government, has been competence. The first criterion has always been, "Where is the assistance that the person really does need?" We do look at costs, but they really must take a secondary place. I believe the Honourable Minister was correct when she said that there is really no appreciable difference between Alberta and British Columbia.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, just to elaborate on that a little: in sending a patient either to Alberta or to British Columbia, very often it is the choice of the patient.

Mr. Veale: That is precisely my point, Madam Minister. That has been my experience, too, in the one incident that I was involved in. I was somewhat surprised that it was patient choice, but particularly when the patient may not know one way or another, and may choose Edmonton because the patient has friends there as opposed to Vancouver or any such reason; this, in my submission, is not a valid reason. There should be some control over that. There is also the "old boy school" of thinking — you know, where the doctor refers the patient to a particular place. But if there is going to be, and if there is, an issue as to cutting costs, which may result in lower health care premiums, or not having further increases, then I think the Government should examine that very closely.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: The Member does not really have a valid point. It is really in the hands of the medical people. I do not think it is an "old boys network" necessarily. If they happen to have confidence in a specialist they know, and know their work and so on, they send the patient, in any case, to the best possible person outside. I really think that the discrepancy, if there is any, between fees in BC and Alberta is just very very minor. It is not a consideration.

Mr. Veale: Well, when the Government Leader comes back with those figures, it will be interesting to see the discrepancies as they actually are. But I would respectfully suggest to the Minister that this is one of the problems, I believe, in the medical profession generally, and will arise in Pharmicare; and that is where a doctor prescribes a particular medicine and does not have a price schedule with him to take the lowest, necessarily. It is not because anybody is trying to have higher prices and so on, but it is just a lack of coordination. In my view, the Government would do well to look at this area fairly closely; particularly because the doctors in BC, like all unions, are becoming intransigent and are talking about extra billing.

My question would be also for the Minister or, if it is a conflict question, maybe for the Government Leader. Will the Government be paying extra billings, should that be occurring in either Alberta or British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I honestly do not know, Mr. Chairman; I am not absolutely certain. It is something that I am not positive of, and I will take notice on the question and get the answer for the Honourable Member.

Mr. Veale: If I could just pursue that a bit, Mr. Chairman: there are obviously going to be doctors who do not extra-bill if that situation occurs, and my submission would be simply that, where quality of care and expertise is the same, we use those doctors who are not extra-billing.

Mr. Veale: Could I ask one question, Mr. Chairman, before you clear the matter?

The average cost per claim out-of-Territory is almost but not quite double what the average cost per claim in-Territory is. Would the Minister or the Government Leader explain why that is?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not know exactly, Mr. Chairman. I imagine that out-of-Territory claims are usually specialist fees; that is the only readily obvious answer. I would imagine that is it; it is more expensive health care and more specialized equipment and everything else. It is just higher medical care.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister just examine into that with officials, to determine if that is accurate?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the Yukon Health Insurance Plan program carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan cleared.

I refer Committee to Disease Control on Page 94.

Mr. Veale: I would ask the Minister: is this area of Disease Control an area that the Minister has any control over whatsoever, or any input to?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, Mr. Chairman, again this is Federal. It is becoming obvious, I think, to the Member, the problems that the Yukon Territory has had by not having a health transfer.

Mr. Veale: Does the Minister have any programs at all regarding the publication of information dealing with these specific areas — cancer, communicable diseases — any information programs or programs that are going to be put forward in Public Affairs to make salient facts known to the people of the Territory?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not know what the Member means, Mr. Chairman, by salient facts. Facts related to these programs — since they are Federal, there would be no reason for us to have it. The information is available to us if we want to have it, but we do not publish anything.

Mr. Veale: The Yukon Family Services Association has a library full of information on these areas, and has some difficulty in disseminating information throughout the school system in the Yukon Territory. My concern is that these costs are costs that this Government can reduce by the information and flow of knowledge — particularly to young people, people of any age. In other words, it is a preventative area that this Territory can get involved in.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, if Yukon Family Services is having a problem with getting information to students, I think a discussion with the Department of Education would be useful.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I take it then that the Minister would be very interested in having a meeting with the Family Counselling Service, to pursue the introduction of programs and information into the high schools and public schools in this Territory?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure which particular program the Member is speaking of, but communication and information is always a good thing, and if it were brought to my attention, I would be happy to look at it.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could give a question to the Minister, which is a bit precise, but she may wish to take it as notice; I do not need the answer in order to clear the Budget, but I would be interested in the answer nonetheless.

According to the Federal estimates, I see that the Territorial Government received \$800,000 from DIAND for hospital care of Indians and \$200,000 for Indians' Medicare premiums.

Can the Minister confirm that that level of funding is being maintained, or is that what is happening to it?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: I do not have that information with me; I can get that information for the Member, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: There being no further discussion, shall Disease Control program clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Disease Control program carried.

I refer Committee to Page 95 and we will discuss the Mental Health Services program.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, once again, much of this department may not be under the control of this Minister, but could the Minister give us an update as to the hiring of a psychiatrist, or whether discussions with the Federal Government indicate that perhaps they will be leaning more towards the appointment of another psychologist, or a psychiatric nurse, or some other avenue than hiring a psychiatrist?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there has been some progress in this area. I think that Medical Services, the Federal people, are very conscious of the need in Yukon — which seems to be becoming more, if anything, rather than less — in cooperation with Medical Services and Health Services undertaking a thorough review of mental health programming and client needs.

The intention is to enrich community-based programs through expanding community mental health nursing, psychology and community mental health workers. This is something on the books.

In addition, a psychiatric day care program is being added to the services at Whitehorse General Hospital. That program will provide out-patient services and day care programs for in-patients.

A contract has been let for a visiting psychiatrist, which I am sure the Members know. This is only an interim measure because, in this way, basic needs are being met, but recruitment efforts are still ongoing for a full-time resident psychiatrist, both by Medical Services and by the private physician clinics.

We can only stand by and try to help show the need, and help encourage the recruitment of a psychiatrist. We still feel this is very necessary. Unfortunately, there is generally throughout Canada a shortage of psychiatrists at this point, for some reason or another.

Mr. Veale: Just to pursue that with the Minister: has there not been some discussion about having another psychologist, perhaps, rather than going after the top dollar men, who seem to be in short supply?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: No, I have not heard that there would be another psychologist, Mr. Chairman. I have heard that there would be another community health person hired, but, again, those are the Federal people. As far as I know, they are still actively trying to recruit a psychiatrist.

Mr. Veale: What is the Minister's preference with respect to the psychiatrist, as opposed to another psychologist?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Well, I can give you my personal opinion. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I am quite certain there is room for a psychiatrist in private practice in Whitehorse. That need could be filled there.

I think I probably feel that —

Some Member: inaudible.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: An uncomplimentary remark, next door, towards the Liberals.

As far as another psychologist is concerned, I know that the present psychologist is vastly overworked and overextended, and he certainly ought to have his burden relieved in any way at all.

People in the psychiatry and psychology fields just do not seem to be that available, and I do not know the reason for it, or else there are more people needing their attention.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister pursue the idea of having a second psychologist rather than a psychiatrist, and also, perhaps, discuss with the Yukon Medical Association some method of creating some incentive to have a psychiatrist come to the Yukon in private practice?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is being actively pursued. The psychologist is not actually being actively pursued, but another psychiatrist with something to draw the person here, that is being actively pursued.

I can, if the Member would like, bring this to the attention of the Federal people. They have not listened that much in the

past, but perhaps we are going to have a new era of cooperation, and perhaps they will.

The Member might bring that to the attention of the Mental Health Association, if he has not already.

Mr. Penikett: The last psychiatrist to whom I spoke about this problem expressed the opinion that a psychiatrist would have to be crazy to want to come to Yukon.

What I want to ask the Minister, because I think this is the second Budget year in which this question has been subject to some discussion, is this: is the substantial reason that the Territory has been unable to attract a psychiatrist in fact the question of income or benefits, the community has not been able to make it an attractive enough situation?

If that is the case, then it seems to me the remedies are fairly obvious. If that is not the case, it seems to me it would be a useful thing to have those reasons brought before the House at some time, so that we could discuss the appropriate remedies for whatever is wrong with this community, in terms of its desirability from a psychiatric resident's point of view.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons, I suppose, given for the North's not being able to attract psychiatrists. One is the lack of a mental health facility here. Regarding the carrot that might be held out to bring a psychiatrist to the Yukon, it is possible that we will have to discuss, somehow, a guaranteed base earnings set-up of some sort. If all efforts prove completely fruitless, that will certainly have to be looked at, somewhere.

Mr. Penikett: I think the Minister was quite accurate in talking about the problem in terms of lack of facilities here. I believe that, in spite of the obvious need for mental health facilities here, there is some indication that previous psychiatrists have felt themselves a little bit under-employed. I think the Minister will recognize that. If that is the case, might we not be better directing our efforts at those psychiatrists who might be near the end of their career or in partial retirement? If there is someone who is ambitious and feels there is not enough for him to do here, if we cannot attract that kind of a person, maybe we should be looking for someone who is nearer the end of their career.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: That is a very good point, Mr. Chairman, I think probably they are doing that, and it is still difficult. It is not an easily-solved problem.

Mr. Chairman: If there is no further discussion, shall Mental Health Services program carry?

Some Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Mental Health Services program cleared.

I refer Committee to Page 96 dealing with Subsidized Medical Travel program. You will find statistics on Page 97.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the difference between "charters" and "airline trips", and why charters occur, and under what circumstances charters will be undertaken?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, I think, generally speaking, that charters are inside the Yukon more than out. Some may be out, depending on the seriousness or the emergency, but generally speaking, charters are within the Yukon.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister confirm that this Government has conducted a study — cost-benefit analysis — of the air ambulance service, and a study which indicates that it would be marginally cheaper for the Government to purchase and operate its own airplane for this service, rather than going to the private sector?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe I can confirm that. I will allow the Minister with that portfolio to answer you.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, it is something that we are looking at at this particular time. We have not come to any conclusions, but we are certainly actively pursuing it.

Mr. Veale: I am just not clear, from the Minister's answer, what the criterion is for the use of chartered trips within the Territory. Is it any medical evacuation from a place that does

not have a scheduled airline service?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Mr. Chairman, it would depend on whether, when the illness or emergency occurred, there was a scheduled airplane coming in or not. If it is not an emergency and it is possible to travel by the scheduled airline, then the scheduled airline is used. If the Member would like some exact figures on that, I can provide them.

Mr. Veale: The chartered trips that are paid for by the Yukon taxpayer; how often are they used by non-residents of the Territory who may be up on retreats, visits and other such things?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, of course I do not have those figures on hand. I would think comparatively seldom; very, very few. I think I know of two or three in the last few years; that is all I can think of. There may have been more, but it is a very small amount.

Mr. Veale: Is there any cost-recovery mechanism from other health care programs and that sort of thing, if a person has a card from another province?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, there can be a recovery for certain things.

Mr. Veale: Is there any indication of that in this Budget, under Revenues and Recoveries? I do not see any indication.

Hon. Mrs. McCall: They are figures that I do not have, but I can provide the Member, Mr. Chairman, with those figures.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the program, Subsidized Medical Travel, clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that the Subsidized Medical Travel program has cleared.

I would like to refer Committee to Page 99 where we have Revenue and Recovery information; also on Page 100. I would ask the Committee whether they are prepared to carry Health and Human Resources for \$22,177,200.

Mr. Veale: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

On Page 100 under Yukon Family Services Association, is that the actual increase that they are going to receive this year, somewhat less than \$2,000?

Hon. Mrs. McCall: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Committee prepared to clear the estimated amount of \$22,177,200 for the Health and Human Resources Department?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amount carried.

I would like to refer Committee to the next department which is under the Honourable Mr. Lattin: the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs Program.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Before we start a detailed discussion of this particular department, I would like to make a few opening remarks. It is a pleasure for me, Mr. Chairman, to present the Operation and Maintenance Budget for the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs. The department's overall budget has increased by an amount of \$658,800 to \$5,540,000. Of this amount, approximately \$2 million is for delivery to the municipalities in the form of per capita grants, grants in lieu of taxes, and water delivery subsidies, transit system subsidies, et cetera. Local Improvement Districts will be receiving, in the way of direct operating grants, \$839,000. Community services for all the unincorporated communities will come to approximately \$227,200. Other general programs, such as mosquito control programs, the television program to several communities, will cost approximately \$226,800.

The Municipal Services has attempted to hold the line on administrative and statutory programs, and in some cases programs have been reduced. The Lands Branch's overall budget has been increased only marginally — \$55,000 has been identified for professional and special services. Of this, \$40,000 has been identified for miscellaneous surveys and administration of recreational cottage lots.

The Protective Services' budget of \$1,125,800 includes expenditures for the ambulance service program. Approximately \$633,200 will be spent on examination and inspection of build-

ings' mechanical and electrical systems, to ensure that they comply with Yukon Ordinances and regulations. \$7,500 has been identified for the final year of the Northern Fire Study. This is a study that we do with Northwest Territories, Alaska, and Greenland.

The Assessment Services Branch includes \$15,000 for professional and special services, which are funds to cover costs for handling appeals. This is a reduction of \$10,000 from the previous year. Also included is a .6 person-year which is a conversion of a .4 casual person to a permanent position.

I should also stress, Mr. Chairman, that this Budget under discussion does not reflect the impact of financial assistance to municipalities as a result of the recent changes to the *Municipal Ordinance* and other municipal financing schemes being introduced. These new financial measure will be part of our 1982-82 fiscal year. Overall, Mr. Chairman, the Municipal Affairs budget is one of restraint, and the needs of the department have been prioritized, to maximize the utilization of available funds.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further general debate?

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it that this is one of the most important Government departments, particularly because, as the Territory grows and seeks more powers and responsibilities, so do municipal governments in this Territory. I might express my concern that the support that the Government is giving the Association of Yukon Communities, in my submission, is less than adequate now, although there is a possibility the Government may be responding to some of the recent requests from the AYC. In my submission this area is one of the most crucial areas in the Territory, because municipalities are the grass roots, the front lines, where people get the basic services that they need. In my view those communities must be looked after very carefully, and given sufficient back up support and financial support to ensure that they are able to provide those services.

I know that the Government is going to be undertaking to introduce a *Municipal Finance Ordinance* in this Session, which is going to prove the long standing grievance that municipalities have had regarding the per capita grants. I look forward to seeing that legislation and the debate on that subject.

I am concerned that the Government is increasing its share of the assessment by increasing school taxes.

I did not see any reference to this in the Budget Speech — perhaps I simply missed it — but there is as I understand it, an increase in school taxes from .30 to .34 of the assessment. If that is not the case, I would gladly hear that clarification, but it is my understanding that that is the case and it is going to result in a bigger tax bite coming out of the residents of municipalities than is presently coming. That means that the municipalities will have a greater difficulty in increasing their taxes and meeting their commitments.

The other interesting point about this department is that it deals with the subject of release of lots; hopefully when the Minister gets into the details, he will be giving specific commitments about the plans of the Government, because there has been a lot of talk about new lots coming on the market this spring, and I hope that he will be confirming that and advising the Assembly or the Committee of both the location and the "when". I think there have been a lot of words on it, and I would like to hear his specific commitments.

A small matter, but a very important matter, Mr. Chairman, is the fire fighting in the Territory, which is an extremely important issue, both in terms of community planning to ensure that we do not have any serious fires which imperil communities in the Territory, and also in terms of the support that the Government is giving to the volunteer fire fighting services in the Territory. My information is that the training programs that have been available in the past for volunteer fire fighting have been cut or terminated. I am very disturbed to hear about that, and I would be interested in the Minister's comments.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a

couple of comments. In talking about the municipalities, I think, Mr. Chairman, when we introduced the new *Municipal Ordinance* last Session, we recognized that we were giving the municipalities more powers. We also recognized, at that particular time, that they would have more financial responsibilities. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons we are bringing in a new financial ordinance for municipalities in this Session. At that time, I am sure we will all have a chance to debate it, and we will be addressing those problems.

The school tax, Mr Chairman, was set, I believe, at 11.5 of the cost of the operating of the schools. So, Mr. Chairman, the particular reason for that is that people should recognize education is an expensive endeavour and — we have said it — that rather than juggling it around, as the price of education goes up, so do the recoveries have to go up. We have set the figure of 11.5, so that there is no juggling of that figure.

As far as the fire fighting instructions are concerned, I really have trouble understanding what the Member across from me meant, because it is my understanding that we are not cutting down our training in that particular facility. Just last month I know of one community where we set up a training scheme for their local fire volunteer group. I understand that there was quite a few people out, and I understand that the program was very beneficial and well-attended. I do not know of any case where we are not continuing this service.

Mr. Penikett: I like the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I wish he would stop talking nonsense about school taxes. We have had the debate before, but he obviously was not listening very carefully the last time we talked about it, so I feel I must repeat some of the facts about the school taxes.

The Territorial Government, the Government of Yukon, is responsible for schools in this Territory. The Territory, notwithstanding the Government Leader's rash promises about not increasing certain forms of taxes, has certain forms of revenue available to it. Among the services for which this Territory is responsible, and has been for some considerable amount of time, are those universal people services such as health and education.

In terms of jurisdiction and the constitution, as we know it now, schools are completely and absolutely the responsibility of this Government. For that reason, I believe they should be paid for by forms of taxation available to this Government; this Government has now the income tax, among others.

The forms of taxation available to municipalities, even under the Minister's new revenue scheme that he is going to introduce and after the *Municipal Ordinance* last fall, are limited.

The principal source of revenue for municipalities is the property tax. Property tax was never designed to pay for schools, either in part or in whole. Property taxes were designed to pay for services to property; hard municipal services; services like roads, sewer, water, garbage collection; services which directly improve the value of the property. Property taxes are just only to the extent that they pay for services to property. Property taxes are a regressive form of taxation in that they have no relation whatsoever to a person's ability to pay.

To the extent that property taxes pay for services to property that improve the value of that property, they are just and reasonable. But when, as in the case of the property taxes as we have had them for a number of years now for the citizens of this City, a third of them are taken to pay for a small part, the Minister said 11.5 per cent, of the Government's school system

I see the Member for Mayo leaving, Mr. Chairman; he always has resisted education. Mr Chairman, the Member for Mayo was earlier this day kind enough to say that my remarks were memorable and that he had committed a number of them to memory, and I appreciate this small role that I have been able to play in his education, but I do wish, if he were a better student, that he were here to benefit for more of it.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the property taxes were

never designed to pay for schools. What this Territory is doing by persisting in this anachronism — because in this community it is that — is invading the tax room that is appropriately the property of municipal governments.

Even with the limited sources of revenue available to them, I believe that it is the responsibility of the senior governments to leave that tax room to the municipalities, and let them decide how they should expand or contract the tax burden of the services they wish to provide to the citizens.

Now, the fact of the matter is that the million dollars or so that the Minister is going to raise for property taxes in this City to pay for the school system, one way or the other he is going to give more than that back to the municipality in any case this year.

One of the problems, one of the crises that we face in this day and age, is the lack of citizen confidence in government. At least one of the root causes of that lack of confidence is the inability of citizens to be able to follow what happens to their tax dollars.

I think that we could rationalize the system considerably by leaving that tax room for the municipalities, so that people, when they get their tax bill, can look at the city budget and see where their money is going; see how it is being spent and make judgments about the merits of their elected officials at municipal level accordingly. As it is now, there is such confusion of transfer payments going back and forth between one level of government and another that it is not even possible at the municipal level of government, though it ought to be.

Now, I do not want to talk about this question *ad nauseam*. I know the Government Leader has appreciated this speech in the past. I still hope that he will be persuaded that the rational thing to do is the right thing to do. Obviously this Budget is not the time, but I know the Minister has listened carefully because he has appreciated the advice I have given him on previous occasions and benefited enormously from it. I would hope that this Budget is the last time.

Now, I make this representation to the Minister: if it is too radical a thing to do - and I know they never want to do anything radical on the other side of the House - to abolish the school taxes in one year, then instead, rather than doing any silly increase, why not knock it down by one year at a time? Let me tell you, if you are looking for votes and looking for a persuasive argument to make to the people in a few months' time, I think the citizens of Whitehorse would find it marvellously compelling if you would adopt this intelligent NDP idea of dropping school taxes or bring them down to ten percent, nine percent, whatever. One of the things you could do is say to the people that, "Yes, we are not going to be ideologically hide-bound, we are going to recognize that this is a sensible and intelligent idea and we are going to do it", and the people will love you and appreciate it and some of you may even be re-elected.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any general debate on the program?

We will go right into the program then. The Department has five different programs. We will proceed with the first program, which appears on Page 106. Is there any discussion of the program, Administration?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: In "Administration", we have broken it down into two factors. First, "Personnel Costs" includes the salaries for the Deputy Minister, the Department Administrator, Clerk-typist, and the Accounting Clerk. In "Other," which is 69,500, the major part of this includes office rental, travel for the Deputy Minister, stationery and office supplies, miscellaneous telephone calls, and membership, et cetera. They come to a total of \$69,500.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what portion of that administration budget is actually involved in land disposal, or is there a separate administration figure for land disposal, which is the next item?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, I think we will find that, Mr. Chairman, in administration. If you will just bear with me, I will find

the page on which we discuss that. Mr. Chairman, that will be under discussion when we discuss "Land" on page 109.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could we discuss it now and just answer the question now? I mean, perhaps the Minister would like a break to find out the answer, but if it is under "Administration", I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate, "Administration" does not take into consideration "Land". This is administration of the Department. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, as we have done in other years, that when we get to that particular subject, then is when we will discuss it. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we are going to find ourselves jumping back and forth.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to restrict the discussion to "Administration" at this time. If you have anything concerning "Land," then we will get to that eventually. Are there any other questions on "Administration"?

There being no further questions on the "Administration" program, shall it clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the "Administration" program cleared.

I would like to refer Committee to page 108 under the heading "Land", "Land Disposal", and to the statistics on page 109.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, again you will find that it is broken down into personnel costs and other costs. The personnel costs includes salaries for the Land Administrator, Land Use Officer, Land Disposal Officer, Land Clerk, and two clerk typists. The other expenditures, which amount to \$78,700: travels for inspection was \$8,000; advertising land sales, et cetera was \$7,500; legal services, appraisals registrations, et cetera is \$5,000; management, consultant fees, survey, cottage lot administration was \$40,000; and miscellaneous expenditures which include telephone, vehicle rental charges, et cetera was \$18,200. This all came up to at total of \$78,700.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise us concerning the several things under the lots available for disposal. How many of the lots in the 1980-81 forecast remain unsold and where are they? Also, under the 1981-81 estimate, how many of those lots are country residential, and how many are under some other designation?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to. This is approximate, but the location of the lots, I will say in Hillcrest — First, Mr. Chairman, I will give the 1980-81 figures, then I will give the 1981-82 figures.

The 1980-81 figure for Hillcrest was 400 lots; Porter Creek, Area C was 172; Teslin - 50 for a sub total of 622. The inventory for the other various locations was 570, making a total of 1,192.

For the 1981-82, Hillcrest again had 400; Porter Creek C - 172; Teslin has 50; Mayo will have 22, Dawson - that is the Bear Creek Subdivision will have 22; Watson Lake will have 20; and Whitehorse North and South will have approximately 100, making a subtotal of 792. Inventory in the various locations was 560. This makes a total of 1,352 lots.

Mr. Veale: I assume the inventory of 570 under 1980-81 is unsold lots which were prepared by the Government in the previous year. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding.

Mr. Veale: The 792 figure, I did not catch. You say in Whitehorse North and South, you are going to have 100; I presume those are country residential lots.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I said approximately 100; it is in that ballpark figure.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister advise how many are available now, or how many people are actually in Whitehorse North and South Areas now. I do not believe it is much more than 100, but I would be interested in knowing what the actual figure is, and how he has arrived at 100 as being the figure to be released — whether it is based on some perception of demand or some study that the Government has done.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I am sorry I do not have the figures of the people who reside in that particular area now. I will attempt to

get it and I will supply it to the Member Opposite me. I think, Mr. Chairman, when we are determining the lots in this particular area that will be developed, we have two things to consider. We will probably consider how many people we think would be interested in those types of lots. The other determining factor, Mr. Chairman, would be the availability and the suitability of the land that would be available for development into these particular types of lots. So I think it would be a combination of the two factors.

Mr. Veale: Has the Minister determined the method by which the lots are going to be made available and the date on which the lots are going to be made available?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are working on it very vigorously right now. In this particular session, Mr. Chairman, I am bringing in some amendments to the *Land Ordinance*. At that particular time, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to explain how we are going to release these lots. That would be, Mr. Chairman, I might say, in this Session.

Mr. Veale: Thank you for that assurance, Mr. Minister. Is it the intention to have the method of distribution in the legislation, or is that going to be something that will follow by regulation?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think we had better wait until this amendment of the *Land Ordinance* is here. At that particular time we will have adequate opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, the Minister neglected to answer my question as to the date of the release of these 100 lots.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I believe I said that we were getting them on to the market as quickly as possible. I would not like to box myself in to a particular date. I have said publicly that we were aiming to get them done this spring, so that we could take advantage of the building season for this summer.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, when does the Minister expect to be transferring title of the recreational cottage lots to the lessees?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, again, it is something that is out of our control at this particular time. We have been assured by the Minister, Mr. Munro, in Ottawa; we have agreed on the fact that we are going to transfer these lots. My officials have been informed by the officials in Ottawa that we are looking at three months down the line for the paperwork to be in place before they are actually turned over to us.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say that we could get them out immediately, but we are waiting for Ottawa. There is a ray of hope that there are some recreational lots, a new subdivision; we are asking if they could speed up the turn-over of those particular lots — there are some 90 there — so that the people would have a chance to purchase them this summer, and start putting their improvements or buildings on them. But, Mr. Chairman, it is in the hands of the people in Ottawa.

Mr. Penikett: If the current state of the economy continues, I am sure the Minister is going to have to change the description of this line item to land banking, rather than land disposal, and that brings me to my question.

Previously the Government has indicated some confidence and courage in being prepared to sit on this land or bank it as long as necessary, so long as it will eventually recover its costs when the land goes on sale. What I am particularly interested in is some kind of indication from the Minister as to how long the Government is prepared to have this land bank; or is it prepared to maintain it, with the understanding, of course, it will recover its costs when the land does go on sale?

I ask that question because of the case of the number of lots in Hillcrest, and there will eventually be many more. If the pipeline does not proceed, I anticipate there will not be a market for these lots in the very near future.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, in the development of lots, I think that, under the present financial conditions of the country today, there are probably two schools of thought.

One school of thought is that we borrow the money, develop

the lots, and pay interest on the money. But every year that we do not develop the lots, the next year it costs more and more. So, Mr. Chairman, in the end, the net results of the development of a lot in a particular subdivision will roughly come out to the same cost.

I think, Mr. Chairman, our philosophy is that for years and years in this country, it has been one of the crying needs of the people that land has not been available. Land has not been available in the City of Whitehorse; I remember when people could not get a lot. I think that over a period of time the Government has slowly corrected this. At this time we have a bank of lots for disposal; I think that is a good thing. I think, Mr. Chairman, our philosophy is, and our goal should be, that we always have lots available and try to keep it down to the very minimum.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no sure way that I know of where we can have a bank of land that is not too large. I do not know how we can control it.

The other thing that I might say is that I have quite a lot of hope that the economy seems to be on the upswing, and I feel that in the next couple of years a lot of these lots that are surplus today will be purchased and built upon.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate just what the procedure is with the land bank lots? Does the upset price for the purchase of those lots remain the same from year to year? In other words, does the individual get the benefit, of the development several years ago being at less cost than the development today, or is there interest added to the price or some mark-up?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman, we do not add mark-up. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we add the interest on, but we do not add a mark-up every year.

Mr. Chairman, just to be positive, so I do not misinform the Member, I will check that out.

Mr. Veale: Thank you, Mr. Minister, and would you also check out the interest rate that is applied to the lands, as well?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Byblow: When the Minister was reciting the lot availability through the various communities, for 1981 and 1982, he made references to Mayo, Dawson, Watson Lake, and Whitehorse North and South. Are those developments that are taking place this year?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman, not exclusively. The ones that are not taking place this year are Hillcrest, Porter Creek and Teslin. The ones in Mayo, Dawson City at the Bear Creek Subdivision, Whitehorse North and South, Watson Lake are new lots coming on stream this year.

Mr. Byblow: Are all of those residential, or country residential, or a distribution of both?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think, considering where they are, I would say that I am pretty sure they are all residential lots.

Mr. Byblow: I believe the Minister has been quite fully apprised of the land problem in my community, both with residential, with industrial, with commercial, dry industrial. The only one that does not have a problem, Mr. Chairman, is the area of country residential.

In recognition of that, and certainly I do not want him to have to disclose any specific plans, does his department have plans to develop any groupings of land in Faro this summer?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: These particular lots that I say are available now, are designated as being available. I am quite aware of the problems they have in Faro. My department is looking very carefully at the land situation in Faro. We are addressing it and I foresee in the future that we will be making some land available.

At this time, we have not completed it and therefore I was unable to put it into the lots that are available, but it is something that we are pursuing very actively.

Mr. Byblow: I gather from that that he is not prepared to make a specific commitment that there will be any land developed, either industrial, commercial or residential.

But perhaps I could be very specific and then he can go back

and answer the first question. Is his department planning to share in any development with Cyprus Anvil this summer?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I am a little at a loss as to what the Honourable Member is asking when he uses the word "share" with Cyprus Anvil. Would he be more specific?

Mr. Byblow: In recognition of the development of land taking place in Faro through the utility expansion, Cyprus Anvil has undertaken to develop and build on a number of pieces of property. The Government does not have any available land, either for the public market or for their own needs. That is the nature of sharing I was querying.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, now I see what the Honourable Member is referring to. What he has said is correct. I foresee, in the future, as Faro is growing, my particular department's probably taking over some of the roles of the development of land that has been in the hands of Cyprus Anvil. Mr. Chairman, as we are reviewing and looking at the situation very carefully at this time; it would be inappropriate for me to say if we are going one way or the other.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would like to keep the options that are open to us, and not box myself into a corner and say we are going to do one way or the other. We are certainly reviewing all the different aspects on land development in that particular area.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Minister, the explanation of changes refers to inventory and management-related projects. Does your land disposal budget include inventory in terms of the categorization of land, say, in Whitehorse North and South? We have touched upon this in Question Period, and I am referring to categorization or assessment for agricultural purposes. Is that within this budgetary item?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman. As I explained the other day, the agricultural land that we have identified as agricultural, under Class 3, under the agricultural policy on classifying lands if they are suitable for agriculture. On the lots that we are considering in Whitehorse North; at this time, I made it quite explicit the other day that we have no intention of cutting up those classifications of agricultural land into country residential.

I think that it would be a great fallacy for us to mutilate those lands, because, as large as Yukon is, Mr. Chairman, we do not have a great abundance of agricultural land. I feel that that land should not be released for anything but purely agricultural purposes.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair is going to make a general practice of having a coffee break at 4:30. Seeing that it is 4:30 now, we will have a short break.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I now call the Committee of the Whole to order. We are back on Land again.

Mr. Byblow: I would like the record to show that the Minister wished that I should ask this next question and so therefore, I would like to ask the Minister if he has found the land upon which to build his infamous liquor store.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think we are talking about something we discussed last Fall as a capital item. I do not see where it has any place in Operation and Maintenance, but just for the record, Mr. Chairman, the Member has offered me some land. I hope when we find out when we are going to build it and where we are going to build it, the land will still be available.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister advise if the release of the agricultural land that has been identified, the Class 3 and 4 in Whitehorse North and South, can that land be released before an agricultural policy is established? I mean, the agricultural policy, as I understand it, is very broad and sweeping, and it deals with land in Dawson and Watson Lake and so on. Can the specific agriculturally suitable land in Whitehorse North and South be released before that report is completed.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the Honourable Member across from me that it would be very foolish for us to go head-long in releasing some land for agricultural

policies. In fact, it would be unfair to the people whom we release it to and then come along afterwards and say, "Now, these are the conditions." I submit that we have to get the agricultural policy in place first, then the land will be offered. That is the only fair way to do it, Mr. Chairman. I thought, Mr. Chairman, I made that clear yesterday, that we are not going to release the agricultural land until the policy is complete.

Mr. Veale: I assume the Minister means then the complete policy? I mean, every last little detail and there will not be any release of those lands that have now been identified and could in fact be released under present circumstances. That is let go. You can release that land now in North and South.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we could release it but we want to try to release it in an organized manner, so that the people, when they get the land, will not have the rules changed afterwards. We believe, in this Government, that we ought to have things in place before we haphazardly dump the land on the market. There is no way, Mr. Chairman, that I can see, that we are going to release the land to the agricultural people and then turn around after they have started and give them a different set of regulations to operate under.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the main philosophy and policy should be in place before that agricultural land is released, and I do not see that it is going to be that time consuming. It is not going to happen tomorrow, but we are diligently working on it, and I submit that as quickly as possible we will get this into place because we recognize that there are some people who want that agricultural land. Until that policy is in place, Mr. Chairman, we would be very foolhardy to release the land.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, when will the policy be in place, then? I am pleased that the Minister has indicated it is not going to take that long, but when, precisely?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would inform the Member that the agricultural policy is not one of my responsibilities. The Minister who is responsible for that particular policy is Mr. Lang, and Mr. Lang is not with us. I have had several talks with Mr. Lang and he is just as anxious as I am to get this land out to the people who want it.

Mr. Chairman: Any further questions?

There being no further questions, shall the Land program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that the Land program has cleared.

I refer Committee to Protective Services on Page 110. You will find statistics on Page 111.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, again I would like to make just a few comments on this section. The personnel cost — I would like to identify what that includes. "Personnel" includes the salary costs of the Supervisor; Deputy Fire Marshalls; Inspection Staff for building, electrical and plumbing; the Ambulance Supervisor; the Ambulance Attendants; the Shift Supervisors and Clerk-Typists. Under "Other" expenses, which amount to \$285,500: that is made up basically of travel for inspections, volunteers, ambulances, et cetera, which is \$121,900.

VHF radio, in the ambulances and in the cars, is \$25,900.

Professional and Special Services, contract positions - which are for plumbing, elevator, Northern Fire Study - is \$750,000.

Training, ambulances, et cetera, is \$43,900.

Vehicle rental is \$47,600.

Repair and Maintenance for ambulances, et cetera, is \$16,500.

Heating fuel for the ambulance garages, et cetera, is \$9,000.

Uniforms, stretchers, first-aid equipment, et cetera, et cetera, is \$9,000.

Miscellaneous Items, such as telephone, advertising, et cetera, is \$15,600.

That comes to a total, Mr. Chairman, of \$285,500.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and I both have had a chance to try out these services recently, and I want to

ask him whether he has had a chance to consider the proposal of the Member for Hootalinqua to privatize the ambulance service, and whether or not it is his intention to act on that suggestion, which the Member made a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, this is something that we are actively pursuing at this particular time. We have not come to a decision, but in certain areas of ambulance services, I perceive that we will, because discussions are coming to a head. We will probably be in a position to say "yes" or "no" in the very near future.

Mr. Penikett: Given that the cost benefit study done by the Government on the air ambulance service indicates that it would be cheaper to have it done in-house by the public than done by the private sector, can the Government tell me why he is even considering privatizing the regular ambulance service under this budget item?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are parts of the ambulance services, where the ambulances operate, that we certainly could not operate with an air service. I am thinking of the area within the close proximity of Whitehorse itself.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about comparing air ambulances with these ambulances, what I am asking is given that every study, not only the study I mentioned that was done by this Government, but studies done by Governments elsewhere, indicate that the Government can save no money at all by contracting out such services as ambulance service, why is the Government actively considering privatizing it as the Minister just indicated.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I thought I qualified that for the Member. What we were talking about is the privatization of ambulances in certain areas. If he inferred that I was considering the whole sphere of ambulance service as being privatized, I want to correct it at this time: I was just saying "in particular areas".

Mr. Penikett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Minister knows in what areas he is considering doing that and I wonder if he could indicate to the House which those areas are.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Again I say that we were only discussing them, Mr. Chairman, but the only feasible areas where we would consider that is where you have a large block of people; the only area that I see a large block of people is in Whitehorse and the vicinity.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, to conclude the discussion on this point: if the Minister does decide to privatize the ambulance service in Whitehorse, I will be screaming very loud and very long.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister inquire into the issue of volunteer firemen training? My information is that that training program has been discontinued. The Minister has indicated he does not think so, but could he check into that and come back to advise us?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, during the coffee break that we just had I did pursue that particular area because I felt my facts were right. I find that they are. Just recently, we conducted a training scheme at the Village of Burwash. Mr. Chairman, we are sending some people up to the Village of Old Crow, which, Mr. Chairman, you represent. We have indications that we want some training done in Pelly. We are in communication with these people now. We are arranging to send our people up there to train the people.

Mr. Chairman, we have two people on staff at all times and their primary job is to train and look after the volunteer fire fighters throughout the Territory. So, Mr. Chairman, considering these particular phases that we are undertaking, or will be undertaking, I cannot see how we are cutting back on these particular services.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Minister, you may be looking at a different training aspect than my question requested. I believe, in Dawson City, the volunteers had a five-step program that they were following, and taking courses on. Now, I am not sure if the Minister is referring to that specific training issue. It is not actually a training, per se, as might take place in Pelly, Bur-

wash and Old Crow, but it is an upgrading of volunteer firemen. Has that course been discontinued?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, if he is referring to that course, if he had mentioned it before, I would have checked during the break. As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, we have not discontinued that, but I will definitely get the information for him.

As far as the other parts of the program are concerned in the other communities — as I have said before, there is no way we can discontinue it.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, in these other communities, as far as the volunteer fire fighting personnel are concerned; since there is a change in personnel as time goes on, there has to be new people trained, so there is no way, Mr. Chairman, that we can discontinue this training process.

As far as Dawson is concerned, I will look and bring back the information to the Member.

Mr. Veale: I thank the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister just elaborate on what the Northern Fire Study is, and what the benefits of that study will be to this Territory?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, that was a study undertaken among the Northwest Territories, Greenland, I think it was Alaska, and ourselves. It was a three-year program; our contribution was \$7,500 per year. We were looking at the various techniques and the technology of fighting fire in our environment. This, Mr. Chairman, is the last year of the program. I understand from the people whom I have talked to that it has been very beneficial; we have had a good exchange of ideas and technology.

We feel, Mr. Chairman, that, from our Government's standpoint, it has been money well-invested, because firefighting in the north is a little bit different, Mr. Chairman, than in the southern areas.

Mr. Veale: Does the Northern Fire Study specifically relate to the protection of communities, as opposed to fire fighting in a remote area?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that that is part of the overall package, yes.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps the Minister could advise what reports have been produced, and what the date of the final report will be.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to notify the Members, if and when the final report is published.

Mr. Byblow: In the area of Ambulance Services for all of the outlying areas, is the full cost of that operation in personnel and the vehicles absorbed under this Budget, or is there some cost-sharing relationships in some of the communities?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is all in this program. The only area that I can see where the communities have aided in this program is in the Member's riding: they had some space there that we utilized as garage storage for our ambulance, but, Mr. Chairman, that is the only case I can think of where we get any help from the municipalities.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister indicate what programs are provided by the Government for the training of ambulance drivers, in terms of understanding the medical problems that they may be dealing with in the field?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, the Ambulance Service is broken down into urban and rural; we have a supervisor in each area. In the rural areas these people are qualified in ambulance services, and they have taken quite a considerable number of courses, I think, from St. John's. These people have sessions with the ambulance people. The exact program or the exact course I am not aware of, Mr. Chairman, because I am not an ambulance driver, but I do know that the supervisory people are well qualified, and they are passing that knowledge on to the people who are volunteer ambulance drivers in the outlying areas.

In a lot of cases, Mr. Chairman, some of the volunteer people are RCMP-type people, and some of them are our own people in the smaller communities.

Mr. Veale: Perhaps the Minister could report back on this in more detail, but my understanding is: — and I appreciate the problems in the rural areas where people are not full-time — in the urban areas where the people are full-time, I understand that British Columbia, for example, has a crack ambulance service and they receive courses that are updated all the time, in terms of cardiac cases and specialty cases. I would be interested in the Minister's providing some information on that.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to get that information, and I shall bring it back for the Members.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion on this program?

Is there any further discussion on Protective Services program? Shall the program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Protective Services program cleared.

I refer Committee to Page 112. We will now discuss Assessment Services program. You will find statistics on Page 113. Any discussion on this program?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I will give you just a quick run-down. The allotments are divided into two categories: "Personnel" and "Other".

"Personnel" includes the salary costs for the Chief Assessor: one Assessor II, four Assessors I, one Assessor Technician, a Clerk-Typist II and a Clerk-Typist I.

The increase in "Person Years" is due to the conversion of a Clerk I casual position, 0.4, being converted to a permanent person-year.

Under "Other", the allotment is made up, basically, of travel, assessments, et cetera, for \$32,000, Professional and Special Services, \$20,000, Vehicle Rentals, \$10,500.

And Miscellaneous, which includes telephone, office supplies, photographic supplies, et cetera, \$6,400.

These make the total, Mr. Chairman, of \$69,900.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, under the recoveries from the municipalities for assessment services, I note that there is a total of \$97,000, approximately, of which 87,000 comes from the City of Whitehorse. Would the Minister consider waiving that recovery from municipalities in consideration of the fact that municipalities do the collection of school taxes? I hate to raise that subject but it seems to me that it might, in all fairness, be a recovery that this department could waive in consideration for the services that the municipality is providing.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member has made a suggestion. But it is one that was considered when those rates were set, and at the time that the assessment rates were set and agreed to with the municipalities. They were in fact collecting school tax on behalf of this Government. It was a consideration that was made at that time.

Mr. Veale: Well is it a possibility, I ask of the Government Leader or the Minister, that it will be considered in future.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Minister and the Minister of Finance have noticed that the school taxes are not always conveyed to this Government immediately on the day they are collected. In fact, if they look carefully, they will notice that they are held in term deposits at some considerable interest by the City of Whitehorse.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Assessment Services carry?

Shall the Assessment Services carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Penikett: Let me ask one question. For years we gone along in this Territory assuming that we were going to have problems completing a First General Assessment, and notwithstanding a number of problems that we have had in the past year of a small nature, can the Minister say if he expects any problems, given this Budget, in being able to do the sort of, not a new assessment every year, but a revised assessment every year for all the properties in the Territory. Does he now have sufficient staff and resources to be able to carry out that work?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, we have just about completed a complete renewal of the assessment throughout the Territory. Mr. Chairman, we feel that we have an adequate staff. We have the adequate background and we were able to update our assessment yearly. Mr. Chairman, by updating our assessment yearly, I can see that we are going to dispense with a lot of problems we have had and experienced in the recent updating of this assessment. But now, Mr. Chairman, that we have a base and we feel that we can do it every year, I feel it will solve a great many of our problems that we have had.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Minister for his answer. I think, there remains though, as the Minister will admit, a number of problems in detail. They are details for his department, but as they affect individuals, they are matters of some great concern. The Minister will recall, last year, I wrote to him about a constituent of mine who was assessed as having a garage on his property which did not exist and the Minister said that that was an assessment error, but nothing could be done as the time for appeal had passed and the citizen would have to wait until the following year. However, the City administration was persuaded that the estate was such that the taxpayer should not be burdened with it and made an adjustment in the tax bill. It does not cost them much to do, but it was going to be a fair amount of money for the citizen.

This year as the Minister knows, I have written to him about one case in particular where the person last year had bought a new house and the Minister's employees had assessed it on the basis of being in a certain area. It turns out on re-assessing it this year, it is considerably less area than they paid taxes for last year. I had occasion to submit to the Minister that this was the same kind of mistake as was corrected last year, but he disagreed. I still have hope of persuading the City of Whitehorse not to charge the person for this error of his officials.

However, what I would be interested in asking the Minister because I know and discover a number of these things, if the Minister is hearing about a lot of these kind of complaints, and that is normal for a major reassessment I would expect. Doing thousands of assessments, there are going to be some certain number of people who are going to be done wrong or feel they have been unfairly treated. How many complaints, what kind of numbers, is it dozens or is it hundreds of complaints, of the kind I have indicated, has he received and does he expect that he will be able to diminish this number in the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot answer that question, because I do not know how many of those complaints we have received. I would undertake to ask my Department if they can supply me with that number and, when they do, and if they are able to, I would gladly inform the Member across from me.

I think, Mr. Chairman, if I find that there is a great number, I think I would have to look at it closely and see if we could make some adjustments, but it is my understanding that there are not. I suppose that any time that you have people doing things there are going to be some mistakes, but I do not think that they are a particularly great number at this time, but I will try to get the figures for him.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the Assessment Services Program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Assessment Services Program cleared.

I would like to refer Committee to page 114, where we will be discussing Municipal Services. You will find your information on page 115 and on page 116. Any discussion on Municipal Services?

Mr. Veale: On page 119, which I believe is part of Municipal Services, there is the contribution of what appears to be \$110,000 to the Dawson City Water and Sewer deficit. Would the Minister explain the various details in that agreement, or, even better, simply produce a copy of the agreement so that we could determine what the long-term ramifications of that

agreement are?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I must inform the Member across from me that when this particular Budget was in preparation, we had not concluded the agreement with Dawson. Mr. Chairman, we have with the City of Dawson a letter of understanding. I believe it will be this week that the agreement will be formalized and signed, and, at that time, I will be glad to bring the information forward.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before on Dawson Water and Sewer, the figures that are in this Budget were made before the final agreement was made. This amount of money will have to be picked up with supplementaries.

Mr. Veale: Does that mean, then, that the Dawson City Water and Sewer deficit is not \$110,000, but a greater figure?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. Veale: What is that figure, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be inappropriate for me to state it until we have the final signature from the City of Dawson and ourselves on the contract.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion on Municipal Services?

Mr. Veale: On Page 114, Mr. Chairman, the land use planning has dropped some 62 percent, or a total \$50,000. In the notation below it is indicated that this is a reduction in community mapping. Would the Minister advise what the community mapping service has been providing and whether or not it means that there will be a reduction in the type of mapping that might have taken place in Whitehorse North and Whitehorse South areas?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: On the land use planning, basically, what the reduction is is a representation of the cost for large scale map processing and programs. It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that probably our large scale map programs have basically been completed. We probably have some fill-in to do and I would submit that that would probably be the reason for the reduction at this time.

Mr. Veale: Can the Minister assure us then that there is not going to be any reduction in the land inventory procedure or categorization of land in those areas, recreational or agricultural. In other words, there is not going to be any cutback in that program, the program is in fact completed then?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the major large scale mapping has been completed. I assure the Members opposite from me, because it is one of my commitments that, as long as people in the Territory want a particular type of land, and we have that land, we have an obligation to get it out to them. I have committed myself publicly to do this and, Mr. Chairman, if that is my commitment, I am certainly not going to scale back on the mapping facilities if it is going to slow up the process. So, I assure the Members that because we have cut back on this that we are most of it has been completed and this is not going to slow up the disposition of land that we have under our control.

Mr. Veale: Just to be specific, would the Minister advise then that in all block land transfers that the Territory has received that the mapping procedure has been completed?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman, it has not been completed, but a substantial amount of it has been completed.

Mr. Byblow: Would it be possible for the Minister to provide a little more of a breakdown of the Special Programs for \$226,500?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the Special Programs, these include expenses relating to sewer flushing, mosquito control, garbage dump maintenance and T.V. systems.

The estimates for those items are as follows:

For sewer flushing we have allotted \$5,000.

For Mosquito control we have allotted \$59,800.

For Garbage Dump Maintenance we have allotted \$48,000.

For T.V. Systems, we have allotted \$103,700.

These make the total, Mr. Chairman, of \$226,500.

Mr. Byblow: In his citation, does the garbage dump ex-

penditure relate to unorganized communities?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure, but I believe it incorporates both the organized and unorganized, but I will bring back the answer to that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Byblow: The other question I have relates to the increase of the grant in lieu of taxes to Whitehorse. What is the explanation for that?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the assessment of the properties that we have in Whitehorse has increased and that would be the reason that there are more grants in lieu of taxes.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on Municipal Services? Shall Municipal Services clear?

Some Member: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I shall declare Municipal Services cleared. That brings us to the end of the section for Department of Municipal and Community Affairs.

There being no further questions, shall the total estimated at \$5,540,000 clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that amount carried.

The Chair would like to now recess until 7:30 this evening.

In the absence of the Honourable Mr. Lang, we will proceed with the Department of Justice under the Honourable Mr. Pearson.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I call Committee of the Whole to order.

We are going to study the programs in the Department of Justice. I will call on Mr. Pearson for general debate.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice's Budget reflects a growth factor of 6.8 percent, which is just over one-half of what the overall Government increase is this year.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that there is a minor increase, one-half a person-year, in the personnel complement of the department.

Mr. Chairman, the general increase in this program is hoped to be sufficient to meet needs of Yukoners during the forthcoming year. A major decrease is reflected in the Criminal Injuries Compensation Program — not because it is being cut, but rather because we just provide in the Budget for those payments we know we have to make, plus the \$100 to keep that particular line item open.

I would like to inform Honourable Members now, Mr. Chairman, that we have agreed with the Yukon Law Society that the fee schedule for legal aid required renegotiation, and, as a result, there will be a supplementary estimate for this program, if we are close with our estimate of the number of cases during the coming year.

Mr. Chairman, as you all are aware, the Federal Government has made what the eight participating provinces and two Territories that contract with them consider to be an impractical demand, with respect to a new RCM Police Services Agreement.

The Federal Government wants the provinces and territories to pay 75 percent of the costs for the RCM Police. That would mean a \$2 million increase in our share. The negotiations, Mr. Chairman, are continuing, and that is about all I can say. I can tell the House that I was involved in a Canada-wide telephone communication on this subject yesterday, with justice departments throughout the country. It is anticipated that we will meet sometime later this month with the Solicitor General once again, and try to come to some kind of an agreement. Any change in our share will be a reflection in supplementary estimates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Budget was prepared by the department when Mr. Graham was the responsible Minister. I am confident that the discussions with respect to this Budget would be greatly elevated if I requested that he come down and join me on the front bench for these discussions, and answer questions on behalf of myself.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on the program?

Mr. Veale: I have just some comments, Mr. Chairman. I guess basically in the Police Services Agreement, I would be interested in hearing — and maybe we can do this when we get into the body of it — if the Territory is going to be assuming an increase in costs, whether or not there will be an increase in control by the Territory over police services in this Territory, and in what respect that is being brought up in the negotiations.

Perhaps the Government Leader or the Minister of Justice could explain the substantial decrease in the Criminal Injuries Compensation. I simply would like to hear that again, because it is a decrease of some \$19,000 and I am just not clear on why. It is only a 75 percent Federal cost-shared program. Maybe you could give it to me again.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to react to the two comments made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. We are discussing accountability on the RCMP, not control. Neither the Solicitor General, nor the RCMP, I am confident, would talk to us about control. Just the implications of the word are not good. However, we are discussing accountability with the Solicitor General, but we have been able to obtain an agreement from the Solicitor General that accountability will not be a factor in the cost-sharing agreement. In other words, he will not try to buy an agreement from us with more accountability. So the discussions are really centering on two distinct things: accountability and cost-sharing.

We have found that it is possible to keep the two items very separate, and everyone is working quite hard to do that. We, and all the participating provinces, feel that there should be accountability, even if the cost-sharing does not increase. That 56 percent of the RCMP are not accountable enough to the people of the province or territory that they are working in, as far as we are concerned.

The other thing that is of interest, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the RCM Police agreement is that the last time this five-year agreement was signed, there was one agreement signed for the eight provinces and another agreement signed for the two territories. Neither the provinces, the two territories, nor the Federal Government want that to happen again. Everyone has agreed that there should be one agreement for the eight provinces and two territories.

So, in all of these negotiations, we are being treated exactly as a province, by the Federal Government and by the other provinces. It is rather nice.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated in my opening remarks, when injury is sustained by someone during the commission of a criminal act, we are required to pay compensation. We have no way of guessing what may or may not happen as a result of that, during the course of the year.

The \$8,000 that we have in the Estimates is our share of what we know for sure that we have to pay. This award or these awards have already been made; we just have not made those payments yet, during the course of this year. So, there is \$8,000 there. The \$100 is to keep the line item open. I cannot remember exactly what the numbers are that we were required to pay last year, but the difference between the two. These rewards are made quite arbitrarily; we have nothing to do with it; they are made by the Workers' Compensation Board. The Workers' Compensation Board sits in arbitration of these awards and they are made quite independently of this Government. We have no idea of who is going to apply; there is no way we can estimate. We could put a number in, but it would be very fictitious.

When we set the program up last year, it was agreed that the proper way for us to do it was to only put in the Budget what we knew we had to pay during the course of the year; if there is another award made during the course of the year then, of course, it will be reflected in supplementary estimates.

Mr. Penikett: I want to start off by saying that, in the past, as Members know, I have talked a lot about the need to create jobs in the Territory, and the need to create employment in

order to stabilize and develop our economy.

On that score, when I look at the 108.5-plus people in the Department of Justice, the 100 or so policemen, the probation officers, the social workers, the jailers and the dozens of people who work in the Justice System in Yukon, it is quite clear that criminals in this Territory create a lot of jobs. It may be that the great social usefulness of criminals in the Territory, as we are now discovering it, is to create work for a large number of highly qualified and highly trained people.

I gather there are also some people in the private sector that are involved in this work too, some of whom are recompensed by the Government. While making that not entirely frivolous point, it is probably also true that if criminals create a lot of work for judges and policemen and jailers and probation officers and ministers and administrators and clerks and lawyers, it is probably also true that in —

Pardon me, the Member for Mayo wishes to speak.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed, sir.

Mr. Penikett: — it is probably also true that in the same sense, these people whom I have just mentioned also contribute to creating a lot of criminals, or at least identifying a lot of criminals. Perhaps even people who might, by some standards, not be normally described as criminals, might be discovered or found or identified in this way.

It occurs to me that a conservative solution to the problem, given that the Government has always been interested in cutting down on the number of civil servants, Government spending and so forth, of crime and burgeoning bureaucracy might be to attack the problem noting that there is an equation between the number of criminals and the number of people involved in catching them, processing them, looking after them, caring for them and so forth. The conservative solution might be to cut down on the number of police in the Territory, perhaps that way we would have less crime, less criminals, less need for jails, less need for judges, less need for administrators.

Since this is allegedly a conservative Government opposite, perhaps this is a conservative idea whose time has come, and Mr. Kaplan, the Solicitor General, has presented the Ministers of Justice across the way with a marvelous opportunity to do something truly conservative.

It occurs to me that the police contract is coming up just at the right point in time. We have talked in this House before about how they think the police-to-population ratio is greater here than any other part of Canada. We also realize that this is a division office here. But I think it is also very obvious that if you go into that building during the daytime, most law-abiding citizens do not have any need to go in there. Nonetheless some of us have been in there recently, and there are a lot of people typing, filing, administering, officiating, ordering, executing or whatever the word is, whatever you do when you are an executive.

Well, it is not only like government, Mr. Chairman, it is in fact a branch of government, and that it behaves like a branch of government should not surprise anyone.

Now, that is in the daylight hours. During the evening and early night, when most of the crime is committed, most of the break-ins and beating ups and the drunks and mayhem and destruction, there seems to be no more than three or four policemen on duty. These seem to be the ones who carry the burden of the real police work. That number might be closer to our real need, apart from the paperwork and all that. Perhaps when the Minister is negotiating the new police contract with the Solicitor General's officials, he might attempt to conclude a contract which identifies the services we really need, and specifies much more explicitly the kind of police services we want and expect, and the hours of the day we expect them to be performed. It seems to me that that would at least present us with the possibility of shaving some of their fairly large or inflated costs off the Budget.

I do not know how much leeway we have to express our disinterest in some of the paperwork and some of the bureaucratic functions that are being done by the police here.

Perhaps we are obliged to pay for them as part of the deal. But if it were possible for us to say that we want certain kinds of police services, but less of another kind that we have found less than desirable, perhaps that could be the basis of negotiations.

Now, the accountability question is something I want to ask about, because it is a difficult one, but I understand the Solicitor General is proposing some kind of national committee or some kind of body to which we might and the provinces could appoint someone to. I would be very interested in hearing from the Government Leader if he is aware of whether Yukon would be invited to participate in such a body if Mr. Kaplan obtains an agreement from the provinces to establish it.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Chairman, about all I can say in reply to the Honourable Member is: in fact, accountability, and the very thing that he has talked about, is a major topic of discussion. The provinces and the territories feel that they should have a large amount to say about how many people are in those offices pushing paper, if you will. How many people are walking beats; how many people are marking tires, whatever. That is what the accountability thing is all about.

We do not know. We have no indication from him yet where that might be sawn off.

At the present time — I must not mislead the House — we do have some capability with respect to the RCMP. Under all circumstances that I am aware of, they will not increase the size of a detachment, with respect to constables, or decrease the size of a detachment, with respect to constables, unless they have our agreement to do so. But, if they want to hire more clerical staff in their building, they are going to go ahead and do that. If they want to buy new cars, they are going to go ahead and do it. We pay, at the present time, 56 percent of that cost.

Our argument, of course, with Mr. Kaplan is that the other 44 percent is Federal work and should remain Federal work, that is why it is the Federal police force. His argument is that 25 percent of the work is Federal work; the other 75 is all provincial or territorial.

Another interesting thing that I think I should point out: a number of the provinces have actually done real extensive cost studies, breakdowns and so on. Some of them have got their own fairly recent experience to go on, and even at 75 percent, I do not think you can find a province in Canada that will say it would be cheaper to have their own police force. The 75 percent number is one that has been well thought out and I believe that that has been the criterion. The criterion has not been that the 25 percent of the work is Federal and 75 percent is provincial or territorial, it is just that that is what the traffic will bear. I am sure that if the Federal Government thought they could have gotten away with 80 percent they would have tried for it. I suspect that at 80 percent, some of the provinces would have said, without hesitation, "No, no, we're going to our own police force."

In the final analysis, I think it is important, not only to Ottawa, but to all of the provinces and to the territories, that we do have a national police force. I do not want anyone to ever get the impression that I am opposed to the RCMP as a national police force. I think it is a good thing, a necessary thing that we have that police force. But somehow or another, when they are our police force, when they are the territorial police force, as well, they should be accountable to us in some way.

So, I agree with the Honourable Member that there is no doubt about it, we are going to try and get some accountability, so that we can stand up and justify in this House the fairly large expenditures for policing in this Territory. At the present time we have no way of justifying it at all.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further debate on this before we go into the specifics? There being no further general debate, can we discuss this department and begin with Page 140? There are going to be nine different programs. The first program will be Legal Services; is there discussion on that particular program?

Mr. Veale: I would like to ask the Government Leader what

the person-year increase is. It seems to be just half a year. Could he explain what that relates to?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, that is a half man-year clerical increase in legal services. It is just a part-time secretarial position.

Mr. Veale: Could I ask the Minister of Justice, Mr. Chairman, on the Land Titles Office, what is the timing of the transfer of that to the Territory? I gather that there was going to be Territorial legislation.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, there were several discussions being carried on while I was in the department. In fact, we have a piece of legislation drafted to transfer the responsibility in total to the YTG; however, I am not certain of the exact status of that. It has to be a coordinated thing between the Department of Justice in Ottawa and the Territorial Government here, so I would imagine probably the legislation will be brought forth in the Fall Session.

Mr. Veale: I would just add to that, Mr. Chairman. I think there is some importance to that, because I am sure the Minister and Mr. Graham are aware of the fact that the *Matrimonial Property Ordinance* documentation is not accepted under the *Land Titles Act* and would be under the Territorial legislation I expect.

Mr. Graham: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, we were aware of it, and it was one of the reasons we would like to see it done as quickly as possible.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, some time ago there was a gentleman named Mr. Cosman who was working on the consolidation and updating of the ordinances. My perception is that it has fallen by the wayside because of his departure. Is there someone who has replaced him in that position and is keeping that work going on?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, there is someone who has replaced Mr. Cosman in that position. However, Mr. Cosman is still continuing the job that he started here with the Territorial Government. He has recently been employed in New Brunswick, and he is continuing to do the updating and the consolidation for us.

Mr. Veale: It is under contract, I presume? The answer is "yes".

It appeared to me that that we had fallen behind somewhat, though, in bringing the consolidations forward. That will be clarified, now that Mr. Cosman is on contract?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there was some trouble. These consolidations have to be done, and then they have to be given to the Department of Justice in Ottawa. They okay them and go through them, and then they are printed there and sent back to us. There has been some hold-up between Yukon and Ottawa; whether it is Mr. Cosman or Ottawa itself, I do not know. I do not have a definite time schedule.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Committee prepared to clear the Legal Services Program?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Legal Services Program cleared.

I refer Committee to the Court Services Program on Page 142. The statistics are on Page 143. Is there general discussion on this Program?

Mr. Byblow: Could we have some information on the reference to the Justice Information Study that has taken place? Is that some assimilation of data across the country? What is it?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, one of the Chief Justices is going to be in Whitehorse later on this month, and has an appointment to talk with me at that time.

The Study is in relation to the — if we are talking about the same one — connection or the relationship between the administration and the judiciary. This problem is one that has been inherent in the judiciary forever. I think what is being attempted is that they are looking for a national level at which this connection should happen: how the pure administration, government administration, should connect with the judiciary.

Mr. Penikett: I have some comment on that, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the explanation contained in the narrative,

in fact it tells me a lot more than the press release that was put out a few days ago or weeks ago. Speaking of which, I might mention, it was probably the most confused piece of public relations I have ever seen come from the Government. There are two pages of it, and I did not understand what it was about after reading it.

Mr. Chairman: Is there further discussion?

Mr. Penikett: I know it is a capital item, but is there anything in here concerning the building of this new court building, which I gather is going to push Taylor & Drury out of its parking lot?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, in every other jurisdiction in Canada, the Federal Government has provided a court building for that jurisdiction. The Yukon, of course, is an exception. During my tenure in the Justice Department, we had requested several times that a court building be built for Yukon, in the City of Whitehorse; however, we were not very successful.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Let me just add to that, Mr. Chairman. It is my perception that this is something that Yukon really does need. The court facilities that we presently have in the Federal Building are not only very very expensive, but they are getting to the point where they are now inadequate; they are just too small. We are not able to rent enough space, or, at least, we have not been able to rent enough space in that building, to provide all of the court facilities which I think we really should have.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure Honourable Members that we really are going to have to go to work on the Federal Government and try to get some sort of commitment from them, quite quickly, as to what their intentions with respect to Yukon and a new court building are. Because if they are not going to do something very soon, we may well have to do something on our own.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I accept what the Government Leader says. The need for some kind of new court facility is, I guess, fairly obvious. I do have a concern. I think the proposed location, in my view, will contribute in a less than positive way to the existing traffic problems and so forth in the downtown area. If it is not going to be built in Taylor & Drury's parking lot, that is fine, but I would like an indication of where it is going.

Some Member: Porter Creek.

Mr. Penikett: Porter Creek.

Laughter

Mr. Chairman: Order, please; order.

Mr. Penikett: The proposal from the Member for Faro may be based on some assessment of need, but I do not know if that is a scientific study or not.

Mr. Chairman, somebody put a couple of copies of some draft design proposals on my desk, which I looked through, cause I am interested in courts. A couple of things I noticed in the design bothered me, which I may as well mention now: the library space in them was less than the library space that is in the present court facility, which would run somewhat contrary to the need for expanded space. The other problem was, and I perhaps understand the Government's reason for this, but there was no place for the press to sit in the courts. There may have been a lot of forethought in that design proposal, but I think it would probably be a mistake.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Member opposite has got to understand that that was design proposal done by Federal Department of Public Works, I think in 1976 or 1977. This Government was not even in place at that time, but we have never made any comments on that design proposal, or that whole package that was proposed at that time.

I should also mention to my socialist friend over there — this is the Member, Mr. Chairman, who last year I remember made comments about myself when I purchased a relatively inexpensive European automobile. I cannot help but notice, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable socialist friend across the way has also purchased an extremely expensive European

automobile, and I hope that the members of the press up there realize that it is now parked out in the parking lot, and I am sure they would love to get a picture of it with me on my 10-speed.

I have since come down somewhat in my required needs for transportation.

Laughter

Mr. Chairman: I would like the Honourable Members to try to —

Mr. Penikett: May I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman? I just want to point out, in reference to the automobile, it is almost as old as the member opposite, and I am sure that, before he casts too many aspersions upon it, I am going to be moving my family into it fairly soon.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, you have no question of privilege.

We are on the Court Services Program here. Is there further discussion on Court Services here? Is the Committee prepared to clear it?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Court Services cleared. I would like to refer Committee to Page 144 where we will be discussing the Legal Aid Program. Are there questions or general discussion?

Mr. Penikett: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of questions, but the Member who could answer them has just left.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Committee prepared to clear Legal Aid Program?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Legal Aid Program cleared.

I refer Committee to Page 146 where the program is Police Services. Is there any discussion on this particular program? Shall Police Services Program clear?

Some Members: Clear.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Police Services program cleared.

I refer Committee to Page 148, under Criminal Injuries Compensation program.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question here. Since the compensation thing now has a new administrator, could the Minister give some report on how that is working, and if there have been any problems attendant with that transfer?

Mr. Graham: The Workers' Compensation Board met only once to discuss the Criminal Injuries Compensation. They had some concerns at that time. They made a couple of decisions. They had some concerns which they expressed to the Justice Department. This was just about at the time that I left the department, so, as I remember, the administration of the Department of Justice was going to meet with the people in the Workers' Compensation Board.

I also happened to speak to one of the people who had a decision handed down by the Workers' Compensation, and they were very pleased with the decision. They were also very pleased with the fact that they were able to appear themselves; they did not have to hire a lawyer or have anyone else appear for them.

Mr. Penikett: I just have one question. I do not know how things worked previously, but if, under the administration, a claimant was not satisfied with the award — I am not sure how well the appeal process worked, but presumably now that it is being administered by the Board it still ends there, does it?

Mr. Graham: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Veale: I am not clear, Mr. Chairman. I guess I do not need an explanation again, but it seems to me very unrealistic to have just a line item for this. One can certainly estimate, based on the 1979-80 actual and the forecast for 1980-81 that there is going to be more than \$100. To put a fix on the estimate, I would agree, is difficult, but it seems to me it creates an unrealistically low budget item for that department. It is not really reflective of what is actually going to take place.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest to the Honourable Member that if he knew what the bureaucracy can do with budgeted money, he would agree 100

percent with us doing it this way, because, Mr. Chairman, just as sure as we were all born, if the money was voted and it was not spent by March 15 next, the department will have figured out another way to spend it, if it was voted. They really do try. It is part of their jobs. That is what it is all about.

But, Mr. Chairman, really and truly, this is one of those items, this is a specific budgeting technique; this is one of those items, I put to you in all respect, that is virtually impossible to even guess, never mind come close on an estimate. There is no rational way that you can estimate how much you might need for this kind of a program.

Mr. Veale: I will not belabour that point, Mr. Chairman. I should advise the Minister that I intend to bring forward a motion regarding the Criminal Injuries Compensation. It strikes me that the definition that I recently read treated crime as an offence under the *Criminal Code*. My suggestion is that the offence crime section be expanded to include one specific offence against the Territorial ordinance: the failure to insure a vehicle. Every other jurisdiction in this country has what they call an "Uninsured Motorist Fund" or an "Unsatisfied Judgments" fund. Those are, basically, so that when a person is injured, they get a judgment; in the case where there is no insurance and the individual driving the vehicle cannot pay, they can look forward to receiving some kind of compensation.

That is particularly important in this Territory, where there are so many people from other jurisdictions driving through without insurance, and so forth. I would just like to have a general opinion from the Minister on that matter.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government pays 75 percent on the cost-sharing deal with respect to Criminal Injuries Compensation. But, Mr. Chairman, they are very specific that these must only be criminal injuries. They set the criteria that the 75 percent applies to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with all respect, I honestly believe that what the Honourable Member is suggesting is an Unsatisfied Judgments Fund. I have had occasion to find out how the Unsatisfied Judgments Fund in the Province of Alberta has worked in the past. It is a terribly expensive proposition, and one which I question whether we can really afford to get into.

However, I do not think there is any doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, we are batting our head against the wall if we are looking at getting that kind of a proposition into the Criminal Injuries Compensation; the Federal Government will not buy it.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on this segment?

Is the Committee prepared to clear the Criminal Injuries Compensation part of this program?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Criminal Injuries Compensation program cleared.

I refer Committee to the Yukon Court Worker program on Page 150, and to the supplementary information on Page 151. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Penikett: I have one question. Could the Minister remind me when the last time is that a review was done of this program? I seem to recall some reference to a review or study or some kind of assessment coming up. I am not sure that we ever had a report on that assessment, and I wonder if the Minister could give us one now.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, there was an assessment of the Yukon Courtworker Program done last year.

Mr. Penikett: What was the result, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, it has been a long time since I was involved in the department and I do not really remember the exact results; however, as a result of the report, I can clearly recall there being some change in the Yukon Courtworker Program, some changes that I can remember recommending. One small change that comes to mind immediately, looking at this item, is that it used to be Yukon Native Courtworker Program; it is now Yukon Courtworker Program, available to all citizens in the Territory who feel that they have need of a

courtworker before going to trial.

There were a few other changes made in the administration of the program. The Yukon Courtworker Services Society still runs the program; however, I believe they had some elections — correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Veale, perhaps you are aware of it — and some of the personnel who are now running the Courtworker Services Program are very dynamic people. The volunteer work that was so essential that was not getting done previously, in my estimation, is now being done.

I think that with that kind of work and that kind of effort behind the program, it is a good program. I would not say it is an essential program, but it is a good program.

Mr. Penikett: Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Assessment Report is of a kind that would permit its tabling in the House?

Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I made the assessment when I first saw the report that I did not wish to have it tabled. In fact, I did not even, at that time, show it to my Cabinet colleagues.

Mr. Chairman: Further discussion? Shall the Yukon Courtworkers clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Yukon Courtworkers cleared.

We shall now turn to Page 152, where we will discuss Native Indian Special Constable Program.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could we just have an explanation of how many Indian Special Constables there are and where they are now in Yukon?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are nine, and we gave permission for an additional three or four in this fiscal year.

To the best of my knowledge, there were two in Teslin, two in Ross River, one in Carcross, two in Whitehorse, and was there one in Dawson? They were dispersed in communities around the Territory to the best of our ability.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the program carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Native Indian Special Constable Program cleared.

I refer Committee to Page 154; we shall discuss the Administration program. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Veale: I have a question; it may not relate specifically to Administration, but there have been attempts to hire new solicitors in the Justice Department, and I was wondering what has transpired with that? Is that now being done by the Executive Council having special contracts for outside services, or how is that being handled? I gather no one is being hired. There are two solicitors and one legal draftsman as I understand it.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. We are not hiring any outside legal counsel to any great extent. I believe there was outside legal counsel hired in a recent controversy with a principal in Mayo, and I believe there was outside legal counsel hired in one other instance. But other than that, the two solicitors and the legal draftsman on staff are handling the vast majority of legal services for the Government of Yukon. The position is still empty for a solicitor and we have made some efforts to hire one, but we find that the salary we are offering does not get us the kind of person we want.

Mr. Veale: Then that additional solicitor's position is still budgeted for?

Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Administration program carry?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Administration program cleared. I refer Committee to Page 156; we will now discuss the Corrections program. Are there any questions?

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, it may be quite evident on the page, but I cannot see it. What has been the capacity of the Whitehorse Correctional Institute in the past year, and what is the anticipated capacity for this coming year?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, we have had, in the Whitehorse Correctional Institute, as high as 95 prisoners at

any one time; that was a few years ago. In recent memory, I think the maximum has been somewhere in the range of 60 to 62; the average is probably around 54 to 57. We found that when we instituted the new options programs and the work release programs, the average daily count in the Correctional Institute decreased.

I am not sure if it is in this Budget or not, but there has been a study started to determine the long term requirements of the Whitehorse Correctional Institute over the next ten years. The projections were done for construction costs, as well as construction feasibility in the present area. It is already in the Capital Budget for last year, at least the initial stages of the expansion are, yes.

Mr. Veale: Is that a report that will be made available when it is completed?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, it is an ongoing report. The report that I had before I left the Cabinet was a preliminary stage report. It is an ongoing study, and I am sure that it will be made available once it is completed. It should be completed in the next six months, I would imagine.

Mr. Veale: It appears safe to say, then, does it, that the new programs of work-release and the new options have in fact reduced the number of people in the Correctional Institute, and we no longer have the concern of seeing it in the Capital Budget in the Fall, or even next year or the year after, at the present rate of incarceration. Is that right?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I should correct that, because the average inmate count went down. It took a dramatic decrease when we first introduced the fine options programs and the work-release programs and that type of thing. However, in the last two years, I am sure you will see that there has been a marked increase in the average number of inmate-days in the Correctional Institute, at least in the last two years when I was in this job. So we felt that it is better to start the planning, now; start the construction now and be ready for the anticipated increase if the pipeline comes, or if any large construction jobs take place somewhere in the Territory. This is the only Correctional Institute, and we felt we should be prepared for that type of eventuality.

Mr. Veale: Do I understand it, then, that the program that is being studied now is one that is going to recommend stage expansions to the Correctional facility?

Mr. Graham: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I think it was a three-stage program. The first stage should be completed in three to four years, the second stage in six, and the third stage in ten.

Mr. Veale: Well, Mr. Chairman, is there a report on this limited subject now available? Has it been made public?

Mr. Graham: I am in no position to determine whether or not it should be made public, but there is a preliminary report completed.

Mr. Veale: Well perhaps the Government Leader might rise to answer whether it is going to be made public or not. You have no idea?

Mr. Chairman: Shall the Corrections Program clear?

Mr. Byblow: I have just a couple of questions in the area of probationary services. It seems it is one area that, from my information, could use additional man-years in the outlying areas. At the same time I would like to hear if there is any directional thrust in terms of the community work sentencing that came into existence a couple of years ago, and is being used. Is there any comment on those two areas?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I do not know about the requirement for additional — I guess it is probation services that you are talking about in the communities. We never had any great deal of pressure on the Department for additional probation services in any of the outlying communities. In fact, in one of the communities where we had a probation officer stationed, we found that he was spending most of his time on the road travelling to other communities which required his services, because his own community did not require him that often.

As far as the work-release program goes, we attempted to

get other interested groups and community organizations involved in the work-release programs, so that we had somebody who was supervising the person convicted or sentenced to the work-release program. In many instances I noticed that the City of Whitehorse showed an excellent response in that area. They provided supervision for a number of inmates on a great many occasions in community work projects. The TEST Ski group was another group that showed a great interest. In fact, I think even before the World Cup there were a great number of inmates up there working under the supervision of persons from the TEST Ski organization. That is the kind of community involvement we were trying to get, and that is one of the reasons that the program was so successful. We found in one community that a person who had been vandalized accepted a couple of probationers to work in his area to make up for the vandalism that had been done. With that kind of cooperation the program worked extremely well and is still working.

Mr. Byblow: Yes, I have no doubt that where the program is adequately supervised it is remarkably successful. I only comment on that area because I know that in my community the question was raised of inadequate probationary services on the one count, and a question as to who would be doing the supervising of the sentencing victims in the work project. I understand from the former Minister that what is happening is that community organizations are being asked to supervise that program.

Mr. Graham: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. That is when the program works the best.

Mr. Chairman: Are we prepared to carry Corrections?

Mr. Veale: Sorry, I just have questions on the last two items. I have none on Corrections.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Corrections carry

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that Corrections program is cleared.

I refer Committee to the information provided in the following three pages. Are there any questions?

Mr. Veale: Just two questions: could the Minister explain what the expenditure recovery for gun control relates to. Transfer payments, — maybe it is transfer payments on the following page that are the payments made by the Federal Government to the Criminal Injuries Compensation. I am just not clear on why those figures for transfer payments differ from the Criminal Injuries Compensation figures.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the gun control recovery from the Government of Canada is three-quarters of the salary of the Sheriff of the Yukon Territory, who serves as the chief gun control officer for the Yukon Territory. He spends roughly that amount of his time involved — or at least that is what we are billing them for — with gun control, firearm acquisition, the issuing of firearm acquisition certificates, doing inspections of businesses around the Territory, and that type of thing.

As for the compensation for victims of crime, we recover again 75 percent of the money expended on a yearly basis. I think we expended roughly \$6,000 in total payments last year, under the *Victims of Crime Ordinance*.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see the item in the Budget as "gun control", because I remember when we passed the *Firearms Administration Ordinance*, we were all told it was not gun control. Of course, it is gun control.

I remember when the Conservatives pushed gun control through in this House, and it was only the Independent and NDP Members who stood up and thought that with this inequity emanating from Ottawa, these principled Conservatives over there, although it was proposed in Ottawa, would support it here.

Some Member: Interjection.

Mr. Penikett: Conservative solution, Mr. Chairman.

What I want to ask about is, we have been talking about the justice system in the whole of Yukon. One of the things that there has been rumours about is the transfer of the Crown Prosecutor's Office to Yukon. Is that coming? Is that in this

Budget, or is that accounted for?

Hon. Mr. Pearson: I really should ask Mr. Graham to respond to that question.

Mr. Chairman, the one major function of Justice that we do not have in the Territory yet that is a normal provincial function is the Crown Prosecutor's Office. In 1974, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Turner was the Minister of Justice of Canada, he suggested to this Territory that the Federal Government was quite prepared to transfer that function to this Territory when we wished it to be transferred.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we took on the justice thing in a fairly responsible manner in Yukon, inasmuch as we have sort of taken it by stages all the way along. It is not my perception that it is the time yet, Mr. Chairman, although I did mention in the Throne Speech that that is the last step before we really have all of justice responsibilities here in the Territory. I do not really believe that we have the right things in place yet in our own Justice Department. There are administrative matters that I feel that we have to get under our belt first, before we can properly seek that transfer. I do not think there will be any problem with it. When we want to transfer it, it will happen.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, just to confirm what the Government Leader said: so it is not true what I heard in Ottawa that we had asked for that transfer then.

Hon. Mr. Pearson: Oh, no. In fact, Mr. Chairman we have not asked for it; we have not even suggested that we wanted it. The first suggestion that we are at all interested, that I am aware of, would have been in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, if I could just have an explanation of the Page 160, the 6.1 figure and the 25.9 figure under transfer payments. Perhaps I am not clear on who they are coming from and who they are going to, to jibe them with Page 148.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, the \$6.1 thousand is the total amount that is actually given to somebody else by the Territory, or will be given to someone else. I believe it is an ongoing compensation payment to one individual.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Committee prepared to clear the 1981-82 estimates for Justice to the amount of \$7,984,000?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amount carried. I refer Committee to Page 164.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping you were going to have a recess before we started on this, but I see we are going to proceed right along.

Mr. Chairman: At this time, I would like to call a short recess.

Recess

Mr. Chairman: I would like to call the Committee to order at this time.

I would like to refer Honourable Members to the Department of Highways and Public Works on page 164.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the other Members are aware that we have started — oh, here he comes.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to inform the new Member to the Committee that the reason for the bell is for people to come in. Seven Members including the Chairman is a quorum.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I am pleased to present to you for consideration the Operational Budget of the Department of Highways and Public Works. As noted by the Government Leader during his Budget Speech, the \$24.1 million budgeted for Highways and Public Works is the largest expenditure within the Government's Main Estimates for 1981-82.

The Department's major programs cover the maintenance of the Yukon road system. This facet of the Estimates amounts to \$21.1 million, or approximately 87 percent of the Department's budget. A large portion of the highway maintenance costs, namely \$10.2 million, covers the maintenance of the Alaska Highway and the Haines Road, which is funded in total by Public Works Canada. It is on the Alaska Highway where the entire bituminous surface treatment program proposed for 1981-82 and totalling 196 kilometers will be carried out, at an

estimated cost of \$2.1 million. This includes 135 kilometers in the Destruction Bay and Haines Junction areas, 10 kilometers in the Teslin area, 31 kilometers in the Watson Lake area, and 20 kilometers of overlays.

Airport maintenance provisions are fully recoverable from Transport Canada. The substantial increase in this allotment reflects the cost to operate facilities expected to be completed under the capital program in 1981-82. The proposed passenger cargo shelters at Ross River and Beaver Creek and provision of an observer communicative servicing at these sites. This of course depends on final funding approval by MOT.

The remainder of the additional cost is due to normal price and wage increase. The department continues to provide building maintenance and office accommodation services to the entire Yukon Government, with a complement of 50 employees in the trades and custodial services areas.

Funding is provided to carry out the day to day and ongoing services at existing levels. As in previous years a provision of \$250,000 is made, to allow the department to carry out services for third parties.

Snowplowing on private roads or work done for companies such as United Keno Hill Mines on the Skagway Road — these expenditures are 110 per cent recoverable.

You will find an expenditure and recoveries statement for our garage operation. All expenditures are recovered from the machine operations account by mechanics chargeout rates, and parts and material issue vouchers.

Increase in operational costs and complementary increases in recoveries reflect anticipated higher operational expenditures.

The Administration division of the department, projected at a cost of \$1.2 million, covers the administration and management in head office of all other divisions and programs. This is an increase of 12 percent over the previous year, and reflects salary and price increases.

The Highway and Public Works' Budget, as presented, shows an increase of 8.6 percent over the previous year. This increase will be adequate to maintain a high standard of services to both the public and the private sector.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could I just give general notice regarding the Dempster Highway and the maintenance of that highway and the garage there, as well, and the relationship that the Government has with the lodge owner and whether that is under this Budget or what budget it is under. I will give the Minister notice so he can answer some questions when we get to the proper section.

Mr. Penikett: Having been through examination of this department in the Public Accounts Committee, which we have yet to report, I am aware that there has been a commendable increase in efficiency in the department, as measured by the number of employees in rural Yukon, which has gone down in recent years.

However, I would like the Minister to comment, from a policy point of view, on the impact of that agreeable development on the stated policy of the Government decentralization.

I ask the question because, of course, the Department of Highways is one of the major employers in the Territory; and by having successfully, through a number of efficiency measures in improved highways, reduced the number of rural employees over the last number of years, has actually worked entirely at cross purposes with another stated policy goal of Government, which was decentralization. I would ask the Minister to comment on his policy in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: On the topic of decentralization as it affects Highways and Public Works, Mr. Chairman, I guess it would be true to say that, as efficiency and road surfaces are improved and new technologies are applied, there probably will be some reduction in certain areas. I would think probably the rural areas, but overall, Mr. Chairman, I do not see a very significant change of numbers. I see in our department that a great majority of our employees, as they are now, will still be stationed outside of the Whitehorse area. I think, however, that

I do not see a significant trend to have either more people out there or less. As I said before, as the technology is improved, I would see a certain reduction, but I think that the reduction would be overall, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Highways Department will be one of the few departments whose services will be more decentralized than probably any other department of this Government.

Mr. Penikett: Yes, but I would like to ask the Minister this specific question because I understand his answer, and it agrees with my understanding of the facts. If decentralization is still a policy of his department, how he will be implementing it.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think decentralization carries a wide scope of projects and philosophies. I think that, as far as the Department of Highways is concerned, our main responsibility is maintaining roads that are at a high standard, with a safety factor for the people travelling on them, both to our own people of the Yukon and our other travellers from outside.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have these people outside. I think that if I were going to decentralize or allot people to a certain area, my main concern would be the safety factor and the condition of the roads. As I look at decentralization as applied to Highways and Public Works, I think we have done our fair share, and in the future I cannot see any reasons why the ratio would change from what we have now.

Mr. Penikett: I thank the Minister for his answer and I appreciate that he has tried to explain the difficult contradiction between the improved efficiency and subsequent reduced numbers and reduced workforce in rural Yukon, and, consequently, a reduced economic base in some communities; it is a hard fact: the reduced consumer spending and the consequent impact in some of the smaller communities, which, at the same time, are getting better road service.

Would the Minister agree then, as far as his Department is concerned, that decentralization, for the reasons he has just given, is not and cannot be a priority?

Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would have to agree that, insofar as I feel we have done our share in decentralization, I do not consider it a priority in my department.

Mr. Chairman: Further general debate? Shall we go on to the six programs that are involved in the Department of Highways and Public Works?

The first program is Administration, on Page 166. Is there discussion on the program? You will note that your statistics are on Page 167.

Mr. Fleming: I would like to ask the Minister if he could give us any figures as to the actual cost of maintenance before the road was surfaced by chip and tar, and how many years, in comparison, does it take to spend the amount of money that was used before on the road, after you chip and tar it?

In other words, you have a road that takes many graders and so forth to keep it in shape, and all the water hauling, in one year. Now, after you have spent so much money, and chip and tar is laid down, how long might it take? Will it balance off in three or four years? Which would be the cheapest, in other words?

Mr. Lattin: On this bituminous surface treatment, we anticipate, by comparing results in other places that use it, that we should have a life expectancy of between five to eight years.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, when I was talking to my department, it was stated that if we can get in the range of six years, anything beyond that we get is gratis.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, on this bituminous surface treatment, that there is a certain build-up, and if we were to re-apply in the future there would not be as much preparation work as there was the first time; therefore, that could be an effective method of reducing the second application. We are looking in those ranges for a break-even point.

There are other advantages with this surface treatment as opposed to calcium chloride. One of the main advantages, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that in rainy weather calcium chloride

can be very treacherous on some of our roads, very hazardous. This treatment reduces that danger, I think; there is a great reduction in accidents and it is a great factor in contributing to a safer highway.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, I am glad to hear that, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to add something to that. Even in beautiful dry weather we still have a mess on the road and a very dangerous situation with calcium, although it has been a deterrent for the dust for many years. I am very happy to see the tar and chip roads there now. I will be asking questions, too, later on, and I think it is in that next page.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister. On page 166 I see Northern Explorations Facilities Grants. I am not clear on what that is, unless it is a tote road grant. Would the Minister explain a bit about that program, and explain the 122 per cent increase in that and what it relates to?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, this program is a continuation of a program, as you referred to before, known as the tote road program. Now, Mr. Chairman, on this particular program, last year we had very few applicants for this money, so our expenditure last year was quite minimal. This year we have already had a lot more applications, and it was clear to us that this year is going to be very active for this particular grant. We have therefore increased it to a figure of \$60,000, which we feel is a fair ballpark figure.

Mr. Chairman, this money is provided to people who are building roads to their properties, and this type of thing. We have a board set up that clears the applicants. We have three people from the Territorial Government who sit on that board. It is chaired by the Deputy Minister of Highways and Public Works. There are also three people from various Federal Departments. This, Mr. Chairman, is all our own money. There are no recoveries on this program.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could indicate the composition of the board or committee that distributes this money, and indicate what procedure is set up for applications, and whether or not the applications are made public. Because, while the tote road program is good for mining development, it also has a great deal of impact on wildlife populations and access to remote areas. What sort of liaison is there with the Game Branch regarding those applications?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, the composition of this particular board is as follows: the chairman is the Deputy Minister of Highways and Public Works, as I mentioned before. Another member is the Deputy Minister of the Department of Tourism and Economic Development. Another member is the Director of the Wildlife Branch. Another member is the Regional Mining Engineer for DIAND. The next member is the Regional Geologist for DIAND, and the last member is the Regional Manager of Yukon Lands and Forest Services, of DIAND.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will note that we have, as one member, the Director of our Wildlife Branch.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a well-rounded board. I think that for environmental concerns as far as the animals are concerned, this person would then balance and would express the concerns of this particular aspect of these roads.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister undertake at the end of the year, to publish a report indicating to whom the grants have been given and where the tote road locations are.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I see no problem in publishing that report.

Mr. Veale: Further to this, Mr. Chairman, what opportunity is there for public input to various applications?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, these people are usually small prospectors or small mining companies who ask for this. We feel, Mr. Chairman, that we have a well-rounded board, a board that is familiar with what these people want to do. They have the knowledge of the roads. We have economic development; we have people in Wildlife Branch who are related to the various aspects of mining and geology, and Mr. Chairman, if we had other people coming in there, I do not think we

would have a very effective committee handling these things. Really what I am trying to say, Mr. Chairman: the people who are on this board are specialists, and I do not see anywhere that a layman could contribute towards whether this person should get this grant or whether they should not.

Mr. Veale: Could the Minister indicate the type of agreement that is entered into with an applicant, if that applicant becomes successful. Is it like a land use permit where there are conditions and stipulations that must be lived up to with respect to tree falling and that sort of thing, water crossings and so on?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, before a person gets this grant, he has to get a land use permit. That is the first thing he has to get. After he has that, Mr. Chairman, he takes his application to the board, they say whether it is a valid claim or not. But one of the first things he does is get his land use permit.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion?

Mr. Byblow: In the Municipal Services of the Administration, I note from the statistics that there are in the order of eight construction contracts that will be addressed this year. Is that correct and, if so, are these water and sewer-type construction contracts? In a municipal sense, exactly what are they?

Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member across the floor is confusing Operation and Maintenance with Capital Projects.

In the Municipal Services, Mr. Chairman, it provides a municipal engineer, one draftsman, the utility systems advisor, office space and related expenditures. The large increase under this heading reflects the services of a utility systems advisor for the full year, whereas, in previous years, we had only one for a partial portion of the year.

Mr. Byblow: I understand what the Minister has provided. I was trying to relate the personnel provided in Municipal Services as to the type of municipal services that they supervised. That is where I was questioning the eight contracts.

Mr. Lattin: On Municipal Services, Mr. Chairman, to a great degree, because Highways and Public Works is composed of the experts in the way of engineers, there is a duplication of some of the work in relation to the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs.

These people in this division of Municipal Services are doing related work, related not so much to highway construction but to the municipal services like sewer and water, and problems of this type. That is where they expend most of their efforts.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would undertake to provide, in writing, the construction contracts and service contracts which were listed on Page 167?

I do not need it at this time; if you could undertake to provide that in the next few days I would appreciate it. I would also suggest to him that that could be set out very simply in notations for the next Budget.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I think that entails a terrific amount of work. I understand that we would have a high pile of documents. I believe that after these contracts are awarded anybody has a right, as far as I am aware, to ask about any particular contract, or cost, or who it was let to, but to provide it in the Budget, Mr. Chairman, I do not think would be very practical.

Mr. Veale: There was one other aspect to that question, Mr. Chairman, and that is whether he would provide me with an 8-1/2 sheet by 11 sheet with a short summary in the next few days.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: I will check with my department and see if a summary is possible.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the Administration Program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Administration Program cleared.

Now I would like to direct the Committee to page 168, where we will be discussing the Highway Maintenance Program.

Mr. Penikett: Mr. Chairman, the most significant changes

in the Budget over last year are the doubling of the amount for road surface and shoulders, and the reduced expenditure of something in the order of 90 per cent on the item identified as projects. I wonder if the Minister would care to give some brief elaboration of those changes.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I sure would. If you would notice the relationship between road surface and shoulders and projects, you will notice in one we have what appears to be a substantial increase in percentages. In the others we have a corresponding percentage decrease. Mr. Chairman, in former years crushing contracts and such were under projects. Mr. Chairman, we felt to give a true reflection of the cost per mile of roads that it should not be under projects, but it should be in road surfaces and shoulders, so therefore, Mr. Chairman, this particular money that is expended on these things was put into this particular category. Therefore it would seem that we have a great expenditure, but it was just a matter of moving the expenditure from one project to another part of the Budget.

Mr. Penikett: I appreciate the Minister's answer. I wonder if he could just briefly describe what kind of things, then, are left in the line item projects, just so that we may follow that in future years.

Mr. Lattin: Mr. Chairman, I would say they would be smaller projects. I think one of them would be small culvert types of projects, small little sections of road, this type of thing, but, on account of the money, there would be nothing very significant in size. It would be a combination of a lot of little things and it would probably better to keep them in a category of projects as against putting them into the general road surfaces and shoulders program.

If the Member wishes, I will provide him with a better list than I have offered him now.

Mr. Penikett: I think I understand the Minister's answer, but if he is not too sure of his own answer, perhaps he would care to get me the information later. I do not want to hold up passage of the item, though.

Mr. Veale: Would the Minister explain what appears to be a minor cutback in ferry maintenance, but what communities is that going to be felt in?

Mr. Lattin: As the Member is probably aware, we have two ferries in Yukon. The Government Leader says we have a fleet; I am sorry. One is at Dawson, the other one is at Pelly.

The decrease in the ferry maintenance costs reflects a reduction of services at Dawson City where we deleted the graveyard shift after the end of the tourist season. Last year, I believe, was the first year we did this; we found that the graveyard shift was a needless expenditure. I think we shifted the hours a little bit so that the people could get across. As there was no demand, we could not see spending this money; therefore, we have a decrease in the amount that we spend on the ferries.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give me the specific details what "after the tourist season" means. Graveyard, I assume, would be 12 p.m. to eight in the morning?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Well, Mr. Chairman, as a rule, in the Dawson area, and during the tourist season in the whole of the Yukon, I would say that probably anybody in the tourist industry will tell you that there is a definite decline after about the 17th of August. After that I think even Diamond Tooth Gerties and the rest of these attractions in Dawson close down in the early part of September. After that the tourist traffic is very minimal. We still have to keep the roads open because we have people going across for mining and that, it is used at that particular period.

Mr. Fleming: I wonder if the Minister could explain the small drop in Ferry Maintenance? I know it is not very much, but that is the first time we have ever seen anything get lower and I wonder why.

Hon. Mr. Lattin: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat that the ferry maintenance reduction is because we had closed after the peak tourist season in Dawson. We had taken off the mid-

night shift or the graveyard shift. I believe, Mr. Chairman, the Member across from me asked about the graveyard shift. My interpretation of graveyard shift is that it is usually from 12:00 to 8:00, but I think in this particular situation, if I remember correctly, we went from 1:00 to 9:00. I think the reason we switched it from the conventional hours for graveyard shift is that, at the latter part of the season, there are a few people who live on the far side of the river but work downtown and this enabled them to get back before the last ferry ceased to operate.

Mr. Veale: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister stated that as of August 17 the ferry maintenance will be reduced? Is that what his statement was? That was the date he was using. If that is the effective date, has he consulted with the Klondike Visitors Association to get their opinion on the matter?

Hon. Mr. Lattin: No, Mr. Chairman, I think he has misinterpreted my remarks. I said that the tourist season starts to decline then. I believe, from memory, when we cut off was in September last year. I think it also has something to do with the closure of the Customs on the Alaska border. I am not sure when they close for the season, but at that time we try to tie in our reductions at the same time.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion of Highway Maintenance? Shall Highway Maintenance program clear?

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I declare Highway Maintenance program cleared.

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I move that you report progress on Bill Number 5 and beg leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Member from Porter Creek West that the Chairman do now report progress on Bill Number 5 and beg leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Graham: Mr. Chairman, I move that Mr. Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Porter Creek West that the Speaker do now resume the Chair.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker resumes the Chair

Mr. Speaker: I will now call the House to order.

May we have a report of the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Njootli: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill Number 5, *Second Appropriation Ordinance (1981-1982)*, and directed me to report progress on same and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the report of the Chairman of Committees. Are you agreed.

Some Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is so granted.

May I have your further pleasure?

Mr. Graham: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Whitehorse Porter Creek West, seconded by the Honourable Member for Mayo, that we do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to

Mr. Speaker: This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 9.23 p.m.

The following Sessional Papers were tabled April 1, 1981:

81-4-5

Report of the Speaker pursuant to recommendation of the Special Committee on Privileges

81-4-6

Annual Report: Yukon Health Care Insurance Plan, Yukon Hospital Insurance Plan 1979-80

81-4-7

Annual Report: Department of Education 1979-80

The following Legislative Return was tabled April 1, 1981:

81-4-3

Mark-up on off-sales of liquor and beer
Oral, Hansard, Page 21